

THIRTY-SIXTH YEAR.

No. 423.

NEW SERIES.

No. 33.

# THE MONTH

*A Catholic Magazine.*

---

SEPTEMBER, 1899.

---



---

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

---

LONDON :  
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND Co.

BALTIMORE: JOHN MURPHY AND Co.  
NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO: BENZIGER BROTHERS.

---

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

## HISTORICAL PAPERS.

EDITED BY THE LATE REV. JOHN MORRIS, S.J.

1. **The Spanish Inquisition.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
2. **The False Decretals.** By the Rev. RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J. 1d.
3. **Cranmer and Anne Boleyn.** By the Rev. JOSEPH STEVENSON, S.J. 2d.
4. **The Pallium.** By the Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. 2d.
5. **The Immuring of Nuns.** By the Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. 1d.
6. **The Huguenots.** By the Rev. WILLIAM LOUGHNAN, S.J. 1d.
7. **How "the Church of England washed her Face."** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
8. **St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572.** By the Rev. WILLIAM LOUGHNAN, S.J. 1d.
9. **The Rood of Boxley, or How a Lie Grows.** By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. 3d.
10. **The First Experiment in Civil and Religious Liberty.** By JAMES CARMONT. 1d.
11. **Was St. Aidan an Anglican?** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
12. **The Gordon Riots.** By LIONEL JOHNSON, B.A. 1d.
13. **The Great Schism of the West.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 2d.
14. **Rome's Witness against Anglican Orders.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 2d.

EDITED BY THE REV. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J.

15. **The Book of Common Prayer and the Mass.** By the Rev. R. C. LAING. 1d.
16. **Religious Instruction in England during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.** By DOM FRANCIS AIDAN GASQUET, O.S.B. 2d.
17. **England's Title: Our Lady's Dowry: Its History and Meaning.** By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. 1d.
18. **Dr. Littledale's Theory of the Disappearance of the Papacy.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 2d.
19. **Dean Farrar on the Observance of Good Friday.** By the Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. 1d.
20. **Savonarola and the Reformation.** By the Very Rev. J. PROCTER, O.P. 3d.
21. **Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln.** By Mgr. W. CROKE ROBINSON. 2d.
22. **The English Coronation Oath.** By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. 2d.
23. **Blessed Thomas Percy, Earl of Northumberland.** By the Rev. G. E. PHILLIPS. 3d.
24. **The Landing of St. Augustine.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
25. **The Hungarian Confession.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
26. **The Reformation at St. Martin's, Leicester.** By DUDLEY BAXTER, B.A.

*The above in five volumes, cloth, price 1s. each.*

LONDON: CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, 69, SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.







## *The Decision on Incense and Lights.*

---

THE decision of the Anglican Archbishops has been unmercifully censured by the party which uses these ceremonies, even by those among them who are prepared to conform to its requirements. Yet it is difficult to see how the Archbishops could have decided otherwise, whilst the ingenuity with which they have contrived to recommend their decisions by arguments addressed to the High Church standpoint should surely have won for them a more grateful acknowledgment.

The case on behalf of incense and processional lights relied principally on the Ornaments Rubric and on the contention that omission is not prohibition. According to the Ornaments Rubric, found in every edition of the Book of Common Prayer since the accession of Elizabeth, those ornaments of the church and the ministers are to be used which "were in use in England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI." But the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. did not come into use, or receive the Royal Assent, till the second year of Edward VI. was expired. The Ornaments Rubric, therefore, seemed, according to its plain reading, to sanction the ornaments in use previously to the enactment of that Prayer Book, in other words, all the ornaments in use during the pre-Reformation period. This was an argument which, we confess, seemed to us of some weight, as we have acknowledged in former articles on the subject. But it turns out that, according to the legal phraseology which prevailed till about a century ago, an Act of Parliament was always considered to date back from the beginning of the session in which the Bill was passed, and the beginning of the session in which the First Prayer Book Bill was passed lay well within the second year of Edward VI. Now the First Prayer Book sanctions chasubles, but is silent about incense and processional lights. We cannot, therefore, be surprised to find the Archbishops deciding that the Ornaments Rubric does not sanction these latter. Nor is it surprising that they should have

sought to strengthen their refutation of the usual argument from the Ornaments Rubric, by insisting that, whereas no provision was made in the New Prayer Book of Elizabeth for ministrations such as incensing and processions, it was impossible to argue for the permissibility of these ministrations from a mere general permission to use, until further orders could be issued, the ornaments which had been employed at some specified time in the past; that, ornaments being the accessories of ministrations, and not *vice versa*, the combined effect of such a general permission, co-existing with the constructive abolition of many ministrations, was to restrict the category of still permissible ornaments to those which had in former days been the accessories of the still permitted ministrations.

The contention that omission is not prohibition, and that no argument ought therefore to be drawn from the mere omission in the Elizabethan formularies of any reference to old-established usages like incense or processional lights, is not in itself of much force, but it has acquired a factitious importance by the persistent endeavour, in the teeth of all evidence, to maintain the continuity of the present Established Church with the pre-Reformation Church of England. On this endeavour, not High Churchmen only, but a much larger class of Anglicans, are accustomed to smile; perhaps, unconsciously to themselves, less under the influence of theological arguments, than of the desire to claim a better title than a purely Parliamentary title, to property in their endowments. These being the conditions, it was natural that the Archbishops should welcome a mode of reasoning which would liberate them from the unpleasant necessity of deciding whether omission be or be not prohibition. They have accordingly taken the course of arguing that at all events "prohibition is prohibition," and that incensing and processional lights are formally included in the prohibition to use any ceremony not ordered in the Prayer Book: "Nothing could be clearer than the words used in the Act of 1559, prohibiting the use of any ceremony not ordered in the Prayer Book. The words of the Act excluded all variations."

The prohibition of a ceremony in which they take great delight is naturally distressing to the Ritualistic party, and we can realize their present perplexity. In the case of judgments passed by civil courts, they could refuse obedience and take the consequent coercion in a martyr's spirit—but what can they do when the authority condemning their cherished usages is the

highest authority which their ecclesiastical system allows them to acknowledge? How could they, at all events in this instance, rebut the charge of disobedience? It is true the Archbishops threaten no direct coercion in case of disobedience, but that is merely because the only coercion they acknowledge as possible is the coercion of the civil courts. They go, however, as far as they possibly can in the way of authoritative utterance, and evidently mean to bind the consciences of their clergy to the extent of their claimed spiritual power over them.

In conclusion, we think it our duty to press, not only on the clergy that have appeared before us, but also on all the clergy alike, to submit to episcopal authority in all such matters as these. All alike have consented to the Book of Common Prayer; and the Book of Common Prayer requires all persons, not only if they doubt but if they find that others disagree with them concerning the meaning of the directions contained in the Book, to resort to the Bishop of the diocese, who may, if he thinks fit, send the question to the Archbishop for his decision. In order to give the fullest opportunity to any who diversely take any question of this kind to give reasons for their opinion, we have suspended our decision until we had heard the matter fully and learnedly argued before us; and we have now given our decision as the Prayer Book requires us to do. We entreat the clergy, for the sake of the peace of the Church, which we all so much desire, to accept our decision thus conscientiously given in the name of our common Master, the Supreme Head of the Church, the Lord whose commission we bear.

The authority being thus competent, and thus fully exercised, it would seem clear that no excuse for disobedience can be alleged. But, when an order given is unpalatable, human nature is prone to rebel, and at the same time to dispute the charge of rebellion by some subterfuge; and this is the only true name for the rebutter that is being set up by some members of the party, who claim that the decision is invalid because the Archbishops have chosen merely to declare what an Act of Parliament enjoins, instead of applying ecclesiastical laws and principles. For the Archbishops, before whom this strange contention was laid, have pointed out that the authority of the Act of Uniformity—with its provision that no ministrations should be allowed, save those expressly prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer—had been accepted by the Anglican Church even from the very beginning. "Though it was not possible at the moment (*i.e.*, in 1559) to give Convocations their proper place, the Church fully accepted the Act at the time,

and its authority was never questioned." The impossibility, we fear, was due to the character of the hierarchy then in office, the Marian Catholic Bishops; but the Archbishops evidently mean that the founders of the new order, ecclesiastical as well as civil, at once accepted the Act and treated it as authoritative, thereby originating a traditional attitude towards it which has never been questioned till recent days.

The Archbishops point out too that, as regards the particular clause in the Act, it had received express ecclesiastical sanction on two solemn occasions: "The Thirty-Sixth Canon required from every clergyman, and every clergyman had ever since made, the solemn promise that they should use the form in the said Book prescribed and none other; and in the manuscript Prayer Book signed by Convocation in 1661, and then presented to the King, the Act of 1559 was set forth at full length, and then formally adopted by the authority of the Church."

Ordinary people would construe such acceptance by a whole communion under the knowledge and sanction, legislative and administrative, of their ecclesiastical rulers, during three centuries, as sufficient to purge away any irregularity or invalidity in the original form of a rubrical direction; and we are quite certain that it would be so regarded by us Catholics and required of us by the Holy See, if, as might easily have happened, some similar direction originating in some imperial usurpation—for instance, of *mon frère le sacristain*—had got to that extent into the regular practice of the Catholic Church. *Lex orandi est lex credendi* we are accustomed to say, and Anglicans are fond of the principle, but *Lex orandi est lex obediendi* is a principle resting on exactly the same basis.

It is on these grounds that, in common with the general body of the nation, we could only regard as a subterfuge any attempt to base resistance to the Archbishops' decision on the plea that it is governed by Erastian not Catholic principles. We expect, too, that this will be the general feeling of the High Churchmen themselves.

Thus the *Guardian*, for August 3rd, says most appropriately:

Is there, then, any ground on which disobedience to this judgment can possibly be justified? We can conceive of three pleas on which such a justification might be attempted, and we submit that there is not one of them that can hold water for a moment. It might be said (1) that this is not a spiritual court; or (2) that the judgment

contravenes the Book of Common Prayer; or (3) that the prohibition of incense is *ultra vires* in a National Church. Where in the Church of England can we find a tribunal of higher spiritual authority than the Archbishop of one province sitting with the Archbishop of the other province as his assessor? No doubt it is a spiritual authority, and nothing more. Its decrees cannot be enforced; it can neither deprive nor imprison for disobedience to them. But it is not for Churchmen, least of all for High Churchmen, to contend that the decree of a spiritual court has no binding force except when it has behind it the sanction of the civil power. They must, if they wish to be consistent, refuse to obey the Archbishop because he is not the Episcopal Synod. If they refuse obedience to the Archbishop on the plea of insufficient jurisdiction in spiritual causes they must continue a law to themselves. Nor can they plead that the judgment contravenes the letter of the Prayer Book. The letter, it is admitted, is absolutely silent. The most subtle lawyer would be puzzled to produce a single syllable between the two covers that has the most remote reference to the use of incense. Granting that the omission of any such reference is not prohibitive, it is at all events equally far removed from direct command. There remains the argument that incense is so much a part of the law of the universal Church that no provincial or national Church can abrogate or suspend it. We can only advise those who argue in this way, if any such there be, to read over again the Preface "Of Ceremonies," and to ask themselves whether there is anything that differentiates incense from the ceremonies which the Church of England there claims for herself as for others the right of using as she shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory.

We might add another item to this plea for obedience, and we would wish to do so in no carping spirit. There are advanced Anglicans who would lay some stress on our view of their present duty, as that of men bred in a system which, though they dissent from it in important particulars, they still regard as in other respects setting the type of what should be a Catholic's manner of action in such a crisis? To such persons, whilst regretting that they cannot agree with us as to the true nature of their Church, we would say, "You will lay yourself open to no misconstruction in our eyes, if you yield to the demand of your prelates. Obedience to ecclesiastical authority is for a Catholic a matter of primary necessity, but there is really nothing of vital consequence in giving up the use of incense and lights in your services. It is not likely that the Holy See will ever require this of us, and if it did we might feel sad at the infliction, but we could not possibly have any hesitation in obeying. It would be a change in ceremonies of purely ecclesiastical institu-

tion, and this is obviously within the competence of ecclesiastical authority."

The Archbishops, too, have assisted any one who might be conscientiously disinclined to accept the decision lest it should be thought to rest on heretical grounds. They are "far from saying that incense of itself was an unsuitable or undesirable accompaniment of divine worship," and even contemplate the possibility of its being some day or on some occasions actually prescribed, it being "not by law permanently excluded from the Church ritual."

It is true that the voice of Jacob is recognizable behind the hands of Esau, which the Archbishops, in the earnest hope of securing peace for their communion, have thought fit to assume. Assigning what they deem to have been the reasons why the Reformers put out the use of incense from the number of lawful ceremonies, they place first on the list the following: "The liturgical use of incense," they say, "was specially connected with the office of Holy Communion"—as, by-the-bye, is hardly the case—"in relation to which many serious errors had arisen." No one could suppose that by "serious errors" they mean merely the belief that the Real Objective Presence is brought about by the change in the bread and wine called Transubstantiation, as distinguished from the belief in this Real Objective Presence in itself, and the Sacrifice consequent on it. The use or disuse of incense could have no bearing on the former doctrine, as distinct from the latter, but has a very real bearing on the latter. We have then another proof—beyond that supplied by the same prelates in their *Responsio* to Leo XIII., and subsequent short reply to the *Vindication*—that these prelates regard belief in the Real Objective Presence and in the Sacrifice of the Mass as heresies, not Gospel truths.

The full significance of this passage may not have been adverted to by the advanced High Churchmen, but not unnaturally they do scent an anti-Catholic bias underlying the Archbishops' decision, notwithstanding its studied and evidently genuine desire to give deference to the High Church standpoint. But, if they can continue to believe in the validity of their present status, notwithstanding the palpable heresy tolerated within it on all sides, and even embraced and regarded as the only sound Anglicanism by their ecclesiastical rulers, we would still suggest to them that the course most in keeping with their



Catholic aspirations is the course of sacrificing their thuribles and processional lights to the Archbishops' decision.

There is a bright side for them, after all, in the recent movement. Their ritual may be successfully attacked in some particulars, though it remains to be seen whether the use of the chasuble may not be decided to be lawful, and in cathedral churches obligatory. But it has become clear that no one can successfully prosecute them for their teaching. It may be, and we believe it is the case, that the Reformation formularies are more distinctly condemnatory of Catholic teaching than of Catholic ceremonies, although the practice of confession and the pronouncing of absolution has a basis in these formularies which it will be hard to upset. But the High Churchmen have this strong buttress to defend them against such prosecutions, that their formularies are quite as conclusive against other and still more far-reaching tenets, such as the denial of our Lord's Divinity, of the Eternity of Punishment, or against usages such as restricting Anglican ministrations to clergymen in Anglican orders. The latter are, however, popular heresies just now, popular with that very typical layman, in whose name, though perhaps not by his commission, Sir William Harcourt is conducting his present anti-Ritualistic campaign. We may be quite sure the distinguished politician's honest, or at all events useful wrath, would not be kindled on behalf of any attempt to put down these heresies as untenable within the Anglican communion, and quite sure that whether it were so or not, no successful campaign in the Law Courts could be carried through against them. This in itself is naturally distressing to the High Churchmen, several of whom, and not Father Ignatius only, have made loud protests against the toleration of doctrines so fundamentally opposed to the Christian faith, and practices so fundamentally opposed to Catholic order. But, as we have said, this difficulty, in itself so serious, has its bright side for the High Churchmen. The only way of avoiding the prosecution of ultra-Rationalism is by pleading liberty of opinion, and the enormity of trying to impede the course of the new lights. Yet obviously one set of doctrines cannot be tolerated on this score while another set is prohibited, and so the High Churchmen may feel themselves secure against doctrinal prosecutions. Their enemies can, if they are shrewd in their policy, get at them only indirectly and ineffectually. These may oblige them to cut off a ceremony or two, and will

be animated in so doing by hatred for their doctrines. But if they let go these few vulnerable, and, even from their point of view, unessential ceremonies, they can continue to teach their doctrines until they have educated into acceptance of them the majority of the people. And when this, the principal end, is accomplished, they can, if they will, again renew under more favourable conditions the attempt to re-establish their ceremonies. They can do this—as long as they can hold out against the ever-increasingly pressing evidence that a communion in which Catholic truth can be held and advocated only on so strange a basis, cannot be deemed to realize in itself the idea of a true portion of the Catholic Church.

S. F. S.



## *Troubles of Jesuits and Benedictines at Valladolid in 1603.*

---

DOM BEDE CAMM gave a very clear and well-balanced account of the commencement of these troubles in *THE MONTH* for October, 1898.<sup>1</sup> As all the latest documents relating to the subject were there made use of, little or nothing remains to be added touching the precise facts of the case. But the scenes described were strange ones, so strange that readers unacquainted with the temper of those times might perhaps receive them with hesitation. Hence it may not be useless to take a wider view of the events in question, and to trace them back to the remoter causes from which they sprang. Much light is thrown upon them by the correspondence of the Papal Nuncio, who is several times mentioned in Father Camm's pages, a correspondence which will show some things stranger even than those which have been hitherto described. But in the end the strange facts will balance each other, and the truth will appear with greater clearness.

We must begin by re-stating very briefly the story of the troubles. Some time in 1603, the Jesuit Superiors of the Seminary at Valladolid noticed a restless spirit among the *alumni*, but did not apparently suspect what was to follow. It happened, however, one day that a scholar, who had been obstinately disobedient for some time, was sent to a secluded part of the house. He continued refractory, force was used to constrain him, he cried for aid, and in a trice the whole body of scholars, armed with sticks, ran to his assistance in the wildest excitement, and wanted to go straight to the Nuncio. As soon as they were allowed out they went to the Benedictine monastery, whence the Abbot sent them back with orders to behave quietly, telling them he would plead their cause with the Nuncio. This

<sup>1</sup> The present article was written in Rome immediately afterwards, but owing to the necessity of consulting books in England, and other reasons, its publication has been held over.

he immediately did to such good effect, that Mgr. Ginnaasio instead of giving any satisfaction to the Jesuit Rector, who came immediately afterwards, seized the opportunity of some unguarded words to cry out upon him as impeaching the government of the Church, and ordered him to be instantly thrown into confinement. The Jesuit, mindful of the fate of the Fathers of Alcalá, who were actually in durance, fell on his knees and asked pardon. After being made to eat much humble pie he was allowed to go, on condition of his immediately leaving the College and the city. Twelve scholars left the seminary for the monastery at once, and ere six months were over St. Alban's found that it had lost over a third of its scholars, and that its reputation had suffered so much that a sufficiency even of bread could hardly be obtained from benefactors who had previously been lavish in generosity.

Dom Bede Camm is inclined to accept Father Blackfan's story summarized above as substantially correct. It is the purpose of the present paper to go even further, and to show that Father Blackfan's story is not one which should cause astonishment. True it is that the episode would be an impossible one in the seminaries of our own day, and that it therefore must and ought to seem strange to us until we advert to the considerable differences which there are between the circumstances of those days and of ours. But when we have realized those differences, we shall perhaps be inclined to wonder at a community such as that of St. Alban's, Valladolid, keeping together for years as well as it did, rather than at the occurrence of one such scene as that described by Father Blackfan.

The most obvious of these difficulties was no doubt that which arose inevitably in an English community living in Spain. The two countries had long been at war, and public feeling on both sides was very much embittered, the characters of the two nations not being such as harmonized together very readily. Yet here were young Englishmen ruled by Spanish Superiors and living on Spanish alms. The position was a wonderful creation of religious zeal, but it is obvious that grave dangers must have constantly threatened its stability. While it is true that the disturbance did not originate out of national rivalry, this disruptive influence was there, and must have aggravated every domestic trouble. But even if it had been possible to do without Spanish Superiors and Spanish alms, other national peculiarities would have had to be reckoned with. The

Englishmen of Shakespeare's day were certainly more passionate and eccentric than those of our age, and the jealousy between English and Welsh was still very strong. Dom Bede Camm notices<sup>1</sup> that the cleavage of parties at this period followed to some extent this distinction of race, and we know that in 1579 the same rivalry had been one of the chief causes of the troubles of the English College at Rome.

There were other difficulties, of which more will be said hereafter,<sup>2</sup> of which the chief were the great difficulties of intercommunication and postage, the pressure of poverty and other miseries, and the want of fixed traditions. Trials such as these would make the maintenance of academic peace somewhat difficult even at the best of times, but at the period under consideration a new disturbing force, more potent than any of those to which allusion has yet been made, came into operation, and will call for more detailed notice.

At the end of the sixteenth century a change of feeling with regard to the Jesuits was passing over Europe. It did not last long, but its presence cannot be mistaken. The violent outcries of the Appellants in England, the banishment from Paris and Venice, the intrigues of Father Mendoza and the heated disputations *de auxiliis gratiæ* in Spain and Italy—all these signs of ill-will were accompanied by open disfavour on the part of Pope Clement VIII. and of the Duke of Lerma, in Rome and Madrid, the capitals of Catholicism. These events and others of a like nature followed close one upon another, and mark the extreme of the ebb tide, whose flow had reached so remarkable a height twenty years before, owing to the almost boundless favour shown to the Society by Pope Gregory XIII.

It will be unnecessary to dwell on the way in which animosity in high places against the Jesuits would increase the difficulty in managing the seminaries committed to their charge. In point of fact the first threat, which rose to the lips of the scholars at Valladolid, was that they would go at once to the Nuncio. This may well make us suspect that if we can find out what that prelate's line of action was with regard to the College authorities, a line of conduct which will have been laid down for him by the Pontiff himself, we shall probably have arrived at the explanation of the most important circumstance

<sup>1</sup> *A Benedictine Martyr*, p. 92.

<sup>2</sup> I have also dwelt upon them in the Introduction to Father Blackfan's *Annales Collegii S. Albani*, pp. 14—19. (Printed for private circulation, London, 1899.)

of this affair. This we may now proceed to study in the Nuncio's hitherto unpublished correspondence, premising that his unfriendliness towards the Jesuits cannot cause surprise, as his unfavourable feeling, as well as that of Pope Clement, was well known before.

Father Jouvençy, in the first chapter of his History, treats of the Pope's feelings towards the Society frankly and fully, though, not having access to the Archives now open to the public, he will not take it on himself to give a final conclusion. *Hunc [Papam] fama vulgaverat non nimis Societati esse deditum, minime vero ejus Præposito Generali Claudio Aquavivæ.*<sup>1</sup> Jouvençy, who is here followed by most historians of the Society, states clearly that Clement was decidedly averse to the mode in which the Society was being governed, and that, if circumstances had not restrained him, he would have altered both the method of government and the *personnel* of the governing body. Moreover, Clement's leanings during the Congregations *de Auxiliis*, are well known, and his rustication Bellarmine, Aquaviva, and Persons,<sup>2</sup> are all indications of the same bent of mind.

Hostile pens have of course described the mutual relations between Pontiff and Jesuits as those of mutual abhorrence. For instance, in *Certaine Chiefe Points of Accusations*, which, however, were amply retracted by their author,<sup>3</sup> it is stated that the Jesuits "eagerly wait for the death of the Pope," for whom they cherish "contempt and hatred," while Le Blanc gloats over the unkind words that fell from the Pope, adding all the evil innuendos that embittered *odium theologicum* could suggest.<sup>4</sup>

Father Jouvençy tells us,<sup>5</sup> that the Papal Nuncio in Spain was one of those who shared the Pope's sentiments as to altering the manner of governing the Society, and a survey of their correspondence on this subject more than confirms this state-

<sup>1</sup> J. Jouvençy, *Historia Societatis Jesu, Pars Quinta*. Rome, 1710, pp. 3—15.

<sup>2</sup> Jouvençy, p. 13. Persons was sent away to pave the way for hoped for negotiations with King James. (Barberini MSS. xxxi. vol. 75. The Nuncio Del Bufalo to Cardinal Aldobrandini, February 23, 1604.)

<sup>3</sup> The Apostolic Nuncio in Flanders, in whose presence the retraction was made, writes thus of it (September 26, 1598) to Father Persons: "Il Decano Insulense . . . dimando perdono ingenocchioni al Pre Balduino in nome della Compagnia. . . . Si riconciliorno insieme, . . . et bruciorno in mia presenza tutte le copie delle lettere." (Naples, Bib. Naz. xii. B. 16.)

<sup>4</sup> T. G. Law, *Archpriest Controversy*, i. p. 9; *Jesuits and Seculars*, p. 122; A. Le Blanc, *Hist. Cong. de Auxiliis* (1700), passim.

<sup>5</sup> Jouvençy, *Historia*, p. 32.

ment. The Nuncio certainly expressed himself with the greatest clearness, and Clement has annotated his letters with *postille*, as they are called, which leave no room whatever for doubt as to his sentiments. From these letters then the reader will judge securely of the tone with which the Nuncio would have spoken to and of the Jesuits,<sup>1</sup> a tone which others, especially young scholars, would have been quick to catch.

One would naturally begin with the Nuncio's letters concerning the College disturbance; unfortunately, however, if he ever wrote any, they have escaped the notice both of my colleague, Father Astrain, and of myself. We have looked in vain through his original despatches in the Vatican, and in the fair copy registers of them, but without result.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps when the exact day of disturbance is known, a reference to it will be recognized.

There was, however, correspondence on other subjects, which will afford us all the illustration we shall want. The letters concerning Father Mansonio, who was to have gone as Apostolic Agent to Ireland, would give us many proofs of the strained relations between the Pontiff and various members of the Order. But they may be passed over for the present, in view of the more numerous and distinct manifestations of feeling made during the exchange of letters about the Alcalà theses.

The subject of the Alcalà theses was the difficulty of passing from dogmatic principles to dogmatic facts, a theological difficulty, which runs more or less parallel with the philosophic difficulty of proving the transit from subjective to objective certainty, and is not less difficult of solution. On this subject then, some Jesuit disputants at Alcalà maintained, that, however otherwise erroneous it might be to say of any Pontiff, that he is not Pope; yet this error would not amount to a negation of the faith—*Dicere hunc Papam non esse Papam, non est contra fidem*.

The thesis had been formulated at the close of 1601, without exciting any great notice, and did not come to the Pope's knowledge till the following March, when it immediately

<sup>1</sup> For the Benedictines of Valladolid the Nuncio justly entertained the highest respect. "It occurs to me to say that this Monastery of St. Benedict of Valladolid is the most exemplary among the religious houses of Spain." December 27th, 1603. (*Nunz. di Spagna*, 58, fol. 357.)

<sup>2</sup> The original despatches from Spain are in the *Fondo Borghese*, iii. 448, c. i. and *Ibid.* 94, A. 1. The Registers are *Nunz. di Spagna*, 55, 58. The Register of letters to Spain, *Borghese*, iv. 162.

threw him into a state of the greatest excitement. A long letter sent to the Nuncio, on the 30th of March, 1602, ends with the Pope's frank confession, "that words fail him to say sufficient of this business."<sup>1</sup> Next day, he sends a censure from the Holy Office, which, however, the Nuncio is told to keep to himself, as it has been prepared in a hurry. The Nuncio, whom the Pope severely reprimanded for not having paid attention to the affair sooner, now devoted himself with all diligence to the task of punishing the offenders. Father Gabriel Vasquez, Father Muñoz, the Rector of the College, and Fathers Louis de Torres and Ognate, who had actually taken part in the dispute, were promptly locked up in the Inquisition, the King, Ministers, and Inquisitors were aroused to a sense of their duty, and then the Nuncio wrote (May 8) to report progress. His despatch on the whole breathes the uncompromising spirit which the Pope seemed to desire, but in a postscript he thought it his duty to add a reminder that there was another side of the question. The clergy and religious orders of Spain, like the Court, were at that time more or less infected with a spirit of resistance to the exercise of Papal jurisdiction, as the French clergy were at a later date. But the Jesuits, "I assure you," says the Nuncio, "though of the same way of thinking, are not so bad as the rest. They are, however, so found fault with by the Dominicans and their adherents [*i.e.* during the controversies, *De auxiliis gratiæ*], that they might easily lose their credit altogether, unless the Pope supports them. I think, therefore, their credit should be maintained as much as may be."

This appeal struck the Holy Father, and he wrote on the back of the letter an unusually full instruction for the answer, in which we see that, unrestricted as his words often were, his real objections were levelled not primarily against the Order, but against individuals, national failings, and the defenders of Molina. He writes, "The Nuncio says very prudently that we must not let the reputation of the Order be overthrown. Still tell him, what he can see for himself, that the pride and haughtiness (*elatione*) of these Spaniards in this matter (for the Italians are not guilty in this point) is so great, that they dare to write and publish new doctrines, and most dangerous doctrines, . . . and this last exploit shows this to be most true; so does

<sup>1</sup> "Confesso di non haver parole da essagerarlo sufficientemente." (Borgh. iv. 162, March 30, 1602.)

the pertinacity with which they defend Molina, which is all the work of four Spaniards, God knows of what low breed (*Dio sà da che razza descendono*). . . ."

The Cardinal Secretary passed back the message, omitting in his official despatch the warm words about Molina's defenders, and after that the Nuncio does not seem to have pleaded in their favour again. By the 12th of August the Pope, hearing that the Jesuits had fully submitted to his decision, was a little mollified. He got as far as to say, *forte vexatio dabit intellectum*. Though that was rather cold comfort, it was better than the prospect of the schism in the church, which he thought he had foreseen in July.<sup>1</sup>

On the 21st he was again indignant at the prisoners having been removed from the Inquisition to confinement within their college cells. On October 12th he sends two letters against letting the matter cool down, and on the 16th he has still only advanced so far as to say that he "is beginning to hope that God will not abandon His cause." Next month he expresses himself pleased at the Nuncio's activity, and hopes that every one appreciates "the need which these men have of being mortified publicly." In January and April of the following year the orders for vigilance are again renewed. It was not until July 1st, 1602, that the order to "cease firing" was sent out. And when the Nuncio writes on August 16th, that the prisoners have at last been released after eighteen months' confinement, Cardinal Aldobrandini answers, 28th September, "We shall wait a little and see what happens. Then perhaps His Holiness will summon them to Rome." And with this sword left hanging over their heads, the *Padri* were allowed to return to their ordinary work. The Inquisitors of Toledo had pronounced them not guilty just a year before, and Clement himself moderated his charges against the theses so far that, whereas at first he qualified them as *heretice*, *hereticale*, and *esorbitante*, he finally only describes them as *queste impertinentie*.

It may be worth while adding that several of these expressions are the more weighty inasmuch as they are so-called *postille*, written by the Pope's own hand. Thus the phrase, which we have already quoted from the letter of 16th October, that Clement is beginning to hope that "God will not abandon His

<sup>1</sup> "Questi audaci et amici d'opinione nuove et singolari, che non servono ad altro, che à metter un scisma nella Chiesa di Dio, et aprir la porta clandestinamente all' heresie, quando pur non sia apertamente." (27th July, 1602; cf. 12th October.)



cause," is itself a *postilla*<sup>1</sup> written on the margin of the Nuncio's letter of September 27th, and it is followed by another less friendly still. The Nuncio had described the lament made by the Queen's Jesuit confessor at the harm done to the Society by the groundless outcries raised against it on all sides. The Pope's cold comment is, *Deus superbis resistit*.<sup>2</sup> This is perhaps the unkindest cut of all, still it is not so much harsher than the official letter of August 12, 1602. "His Holiness says that what you suggest and they merit, in the matter of chastisement and repression, is but too true. . . . Time will afford an opportunity of doing this to their particular mortification. It shall be kept in memory."

But we have seen quite enough to illustrate the main point, which needed to be made clear, that the Jesuits were for the moment under a cloud. Instead of the popularity, which they had enjoyed twenty years previously, they were in disfavour even with the highest authorities of the Church.

Though this account of Pope Clement can hardly be pleasant reading for a Catholic or for an admirer of the Papacy or the Society of Jesus, yet no one will profess surprise at it, who remembers that nature remains human in all, in saint and sinner, in Pope, priest, and layman. But even if the truth had been distinctly damaging to the reputations of the parties concerned, it has also a certain countervailing advantage, which is worthy of notice. It provides us with an overwhelming answer to a certain unfair accusation, the plausibility of which lies in the supposed over-intimacy of the Jesuits with the Pontiff. Thus it has been maintained that the institution of the Archpriest in England was due to Father Persons' power at Rome, and that by means of that device he intended to extend his power over the secular clergy in England. When, however, we remember what were the feelings towards the Society of that Pontiff, who repeatedly confirmed the Archpriest's authority, and declared that it had been instituted with his approbation, we shall at once see how unworthy of credit is the insinuation against the Jesuits. On the other hand, the facility with which the Appellants won their successes at Rome, acquires a new complexion.

Though our present inquiry does not require of itself a further investigation into the reasons of Pope Clement's dis-

<sup>1</sup> "Finalmente Dio non abandonera la causa sua." (*Nunz. di Spagna*, 55, f. 354.)

<sup>2</sup> Suppressed in the official answer, October 16th.



favour, yet it would be unsatisfactory to leave that subject quite untouched, and a brief survey of it may throw some further side-lights upon the question before us.

The reasons will appear to have been two, the faults of the Jesuits themselves, and the new ideas of Clement VIII. The new ideas of Clement can hardly be explained in brief—that would involve a condensed history of the Reformation period—but it may be stated summarily that his three great predecessors, Pius V., Gregory XIII., and Sixtus V., had faced the problem of the conversion of the world, regardless of danger, in a grand, sweeping, mediæval way, which had for the moment an astonishing success, but was not a very practical policy for all time. Clement, in absolving Henry of France, entered upon a new line of policy, amiable, diplomatic, cautious, content with gains small but sure—in short, the sort of modern Papal policy with which we are familiar. Now every one knows that it is easier for a general to determine on a change of front than for his fighting line to carry out his commands. And so, to his disappointment, Clement found that many Catholics, and several outlying Jesuits among them, could not follow his most reasonable change of tactics. Hence disorder in the ranks, and misunderstandings between commanders and commanded, until the new ideas had been assimilated. Then the old fighting order was reformed, and things proceeded as they had done before. The talk of schism, which we have heard the Pope use, may be likened to the strong language in which generals are said to indulge when, in the midst of some critical manœuvre, they see the wing collide with the centre. All is confusion, and nothing can save the army from defeat but previous habits of discipline. But discipline has often done so, and it did so here. The pontificates of Clement's successors, Paul V. and Urban VIII., were periods of peaceful but vigorous expansion, second only in brilliancy to those of the trio of great pontificates which followed the Council of Trent.

With this brief explanation of the more fundamental grievance of Clement against the Jesuits, let us turn to the faults which were then noticeable in certain members of the Order. To deny all faults on the Jesuits' side would not only be useless, but would even result in making their case seem worse than it really is. In the Nuncio of Spain's correspondence, from which we have already quoted, there occurs an amusing and apposite example of the futility of attempting

any such a denial. Mgr. Ginnasio describes<sup>1</sup> how, after he had been doing his best to make the Inquisitors at Valladolid take the Pope's severe view of the error of the Jesuits at Alcalá, the confident Father Creswell presented himself, and calmly begged the Nuncio to take up the defence of the Jesuits, who, he assured him, were *tutti santi* (so at least Mgr. Ginnasio put it), and the only bulwark of the Church against her enemies. The effect on the Nuncio, still warm with his late struggle, can be imagined. Creswell drew upon himself the full force of the Italian's rhetoric, and only escaped by confessing, "amongst other things," that the theses were indeed scandalous, and praying that the Father General at least should be held guiltless. Blindness to the faults of his own side had exposed him to a decided diplomatic defeat.

Far be it from us to adopt Father Creswell's language of indiscriminate praise, or the tone of panegyric, which in ages less critical than ours was frequent among historians. The exigency of the case before us requires that we should recognize faults in the Jesuits in their conduct towards others, and faults not of human frailty only. It is impossible to believe that the Pope and so many of his prelates would have gone so far as we have seen they did, without having substantial, even if insufficient, reasons for what they said and did. Moreover, shortcomings similar to those charged against the Jesuits by outside adversaries, were sometimes imputed to them by their own brethren and other certainly unprejudiced witnesses.

To descend to particulars. I think we shall not be far wrong in saying that one fault not uncommon amongst them at that time, was overmasterfulness. This is a failing frequent among reformers, religious as well as lay, and springs from that subtle impatience which impels some good people to try and put everything right at once. They grasp too quickly at forcible means to impose their improvements on others, and when they have got a power with which they can do good, they cling to it, and are unwilling to give it up, even when, all things considered, it is a duty to do so.

A contrast between my conclusions and the false accusations of a kindred nature, which have often been brought against these same Fathers, will perhaps make my meaning clearer.

<sup>1</sup> *Nunz. di Spagna*, vol. 55, p. 281.

The burden of the adverse charges is that the Jesuits aimed at attaining powers, which no combination of circumstances could justify them in assuming, that they endeavoured to depress or set aside duly constituted authorities in order to have free scope for their usurped jurisdiction, and also that they made use of all means, even those that were unfair and dishonourable, in order to attain the ends they had in view. Such allegations cannot possibly be substantiated. The talk of their unscrupulousness and their depressing rivals has no foundation in anything that really existed in fact, and the assertion that they coveted powers which could *never* be justly theirs, is also quite false, as it stands. It bears, however, a certain similarity to the moderate indictment, which can, I think, be fairly urged against the Fathers. There is a love of power which is holy, and a readiness to take the lead which is commendable, and the Jesuits, while taking the lead in reforming abuses and advancing knowledge, can, so far, only deserve our praise. Their error was that they were sometimes imperious or imprudent in their use of the power they had honourably acquired, or that they continued to maintain dominant positions, which an emergency had quite justified their assuming, when that justifying emergency was passing away.

An instance of the offence given by them as prominent leaders of thought in Spain has been already seen; others might be added of similar irritation caused in Italy and Germany by their foundations of colleges, in France and England by their prominence in the reorganization of the Church. Father Persons' work for England is familiar to English readers, and so it may be suitably discussed as an example.

When he and Campion came to England at midsummer, 1580, the Catholics were in a very desperate condition, though perhaps not quite so bad a state as they had been in a year or two earlier, for a handful of Seminary priests had strangely encouraged and strengthened many. Then came Persons' and Campion's one year of preaching, the results of which were extraordinary; no such success had been heard of before, or was to be repeated afterwards.

It was a great success, and nobly won, but in attempting to secure it, we see that Persons employed himself in things he ought to have left alone. Without sufficient confidence in the policy of leaving politics to politicians, little by little and under circumstances which afford him great excuse, he undertakes a

politician's rôle, and after a while we find him decidedly in a false position.

The history of Father Persons being drawn into politics is not yet very satisfactorily chronicled.<sup>1</sup> He began his missionary career by attending simply and solely to spiritual ministrations, but he soon saw, as all the world saw, that some political protection from without was necessary against a persecution which seemed, morally speaking, irresistible by any mere force of patience, however heroic. Then, after he had left England, he found that the French Catholics highly approved of appeals to force against the Huguenots. Finally, when ordered by the Nuncio at Paris, who spoke to him with an authority superior to that even of his General,<sup>2</sup> he undertook a political mission to Spain, and remained for several years a trusted counsellor and messenger of the Catholic Powers during their negotiations for armed intervention in favour of English Catholics. In doing this he was placing himself in a very false position. His action could only be justified on the plea of overwhelming necessity, while, as the result finally showed, it was all the time a political error. The "Principles of the Revolution" (I use the words in the sense generally approved of by the English-speaking world), seem at first sight to be exactly applicable. There was the notorious and unbearable tyranny, on the one hand, and on the other the apparent practicability of shaking it off without detriment to the body politic,<sup>3</sup> by

<sup>1</sup> An article appeared on this subject in the *Edinburgh Review* (April, 1898), entitled, "English Jesuits and Scotch Intrigues." In opposition to it I contend that the account of the proceedings previous to 1581 is largely based on documents which are either fictitious or valueless. The account of the negotiations of that year is drawn from undoubtedly authentic documents, but, so far as these papers go, they seem to me to prove that Persons took no part whatever in politics during that time. I am at one with most of the remaining conclusions of the writer.

<sup>2</sup> This is a point on which Persons' defenders should insist. He says of his and Creighton's mission, "Commandandoglilo il Nuntio Apostolico et persuadendoglilo li altri, non pottero ricusare." (*Allen's Letters*, p. 129, n.) "Judicavimus . . . PP. Creitonnum et Personium . . . mittendos." (Allen to Gregory XIII. *ibid.* p. 130.) The answer from Rome said that the Pope, "Ne ha sentito tanto piacere quanto se si trattasse di l'impresa di Terrasanta. . . . E stato molto a proposito, che sia andato a Sua Majesta [*i.e.* of Spain] il Pre Roberto [Persons]." (Cardinal Como to the Nuncio at Paris, May 28 and June 25, 1582. Arch. Vat., N. di Francia, xvi. 156, 165.)

<sup>3</sup> This is another important point in the defence of Allen and Persons. They always rejected the idea of a mere hostile invasion, declaring that the liberation movement must be national if it was to succeed. "A most certain thing is, that to think of prevailing in England, without keeping up a national party, would be a most serious delusion." (Persons to Ydiaquez (Spanish), April 4, 1591. Knox, *Allen's Letters*, p. 330. Allen's opinion, *Ibid.* p. 418 c.) "Catholics from the first desired, not

the means he advocated. Nevertheless, to me it seems that that practicability was apparent only, and that this is proved by the need which there was for his services. So large a scheme so largely dependent on clerical aid cannot have been a practical one for England. In Rome, France, and Spain, it would have been different; Church and State were not so divided there, as they were already here. It is a very substantial element in Father Persons' excuse to say, that he took the step we condemn in a foreign country and under foreign influences, such as would have justified a foreigner in taking it.

Nor was English influence altogether wanting. The words and example of men like Allen, Sander, and others who had been employed for some time in similar negotiations, cannot but have had a great influence on Father Persons, who was still a young convert and a young priest. Nevertheless, for my part, I cannot but repeat my belief that, whether we speak of Allen, Sander, or Persons, the necessity for clerical assistance connoted the dearth of adequate lay support, and that without such support in abundance final success was hopeless. The time would come, and had come, before the disturbances at Valladolid took place, when this fault in leadership would make itself manifest, and people would ask why these men had undertaken to lead at all; they would blame unmercifully the errors of those who had exceeded their powers, whilst others would be found to exaggerate the offence committed, and characterize it as treason and crime.

Soberly considered, however, Father Persons' conduct deserves a much lighter censure. He was animated throughout by sincere patriotism, and can plead in self-defence many undeniable and far-reaching excuses. He served no personal ambitions, he descended to no dishonourable practices. But in excess of zeal, in over-anxiety for the triumph of right, in undisciplined readiness to rush into the breach, he took part in unworkable schemes for the forcible rectification of gross abuses—schemes in which, even had they been practicable, it was unbecfitting for him to engage.

Many have said that Father Persons' errors, in connection with the establishment and defence of the rudimentary hierarchy

grand armadas nor armies, which might make the people fear some evil intent, . . . but assistance in moderation (*un soccorso moderato*). No one, who knows England, doubts that, but for suspicions of conquest, the Catholic faith would have kept and would count to-day many more friends than heresy has." (Creswell to Philip III. November 25, 1613 (Arch. Gen. S.J. Ang. Hist. ii. 513), Spanish MS.)

of Archpriest and Assistants to govern the English secular clergy, were due to the same tendency to masterfulness. But there is no proof for this assertion, and, as we have seen, the Jesuits were far from being able to exert an undue influence at Rome at the time when the Archpriest's jurisdiction was founded. On the other hand, Persons cannot be held blameless in all he did in defence of the institution after its establishment. It may be that there was a touch of the old forwardness in the promptitude with which he ran to the Archpriest's assistance. But upon the whole, the source of his faults in this case seems to have been *esprit de corps*.

In our days we do not look upon competition and rivalry as things intrinsically evil. We rather encourage them, and we laugh at little excesses in this matter, at which our ancestors would have taken scandal. Rivalry even between the secular and regular clergy can have its useful and rightful place, even though, like other good things, it is liable to abuse. In our English Church these possibilities for evil developed with incredible rapidity during the short interregnum between the death of Cardinal Allen and the confirmation of the Archpriest's jurisdiction. Commencing in Wisbeach and Flanders, divisions soon split every community of English Catholics at home and abroad, and the Jesuits, whether they liked it or not, found themselves everywhere the subject of contention. The warmth and acrimony of the recriminations were unprecedented. Even a man like Dean Gifford, a future Archbishop, a man certainly endowed "with a singularly gentle and amiable disposition," so far forgot his better nature as to charge the Jesuits with frequent if not formal murder, simony, robbery, overweening ambition, and other like enormities, the retraction of which has been already referred to. Can we wonder if Father Persons, his *esprit de corps* deeply wounded by such attacks, descended for the moment to similar acrimony in self-defence?

Looking to the multitude and rancour of the attacks, the defence was comparatively moderate. It is a subject of congratulation that in Mr. Law's list of books,<sup>1</sup> published during the Appellant controversy, only three are by Jesuits (one of these being a tiny manuscript tract) to seventeen by their adversaries. Still they were three too many, in so far as their demerits outweigh their good services. Persons' *Apologie* may, indeed, claim to be relatively moderate in tone, and to have

<sup>1</sup> *Jesuits and Seculars*, pp. cxxviii, to cl.



the merit of defending ecclesiastical authority. Nevertheless, many uncharitable passages in his *Manifestation* must be deeply regretted. On the whole, these publications have given more satisfaction to the enemies than to the friends of orthodoxy and authority.<sup>1</sup> It was again an abuse of party spirit to make the very name of Appellants a by-word of reproach, to hold the better members of that party guilty of the excesses of the least worthy, to account their friends as *ipso facto* enemies to Jesuits.

These faults were committed, and they are serious enough, but some allowance may be made for the provocation that was given. A few years before the Jesuits had been enthusiastically welcomed as messengers from Heaven, and had, in return, given their labours most generously for the advancement of the secular clergy, yet now, without any obvious reason, the Society was overwhelmed with abuse. Indeed, with so cool a friend as Clement on the throne, it almost looked as if the Jesuits might have been banished from England, as they were from Paris, and have had the Seminaries ignominiously taken from their charge. Their adversaries were intriguing among the prelates of Clement's Court to obtain these objects, and success did not seem impossible of attainment. Hence the unconcealed anxiety of the Jesuits to see the posts of responsibility among the clergy filled with men of a friendly spirit, and their wish to have a consultative voice in matters of importance. That was very natural, but not very helpful; for their anxiety was perceived and attributed to other and baser motives.

Partisanship, then, and desire of power, in the modified sense that has been described, are certainly to be admitted as among the failings of Father Persons and his friends. It need hardly be added that there are other accusations against these Jesuits, the list of which comprises almost every crime that man can commit. There is no need to dwell on these extravagances here, except to note that extravagant as they were they had their effect. Throw mud enough and some will stick, is a proverb the

<sup>1</sup> The memorial on the personal failings of the representatives of the Appellants (summarized in Tierney, iii. clvii.), deeply regrettable as it is, does not seem to fall under quite the same condemnation. It was a communication made in confidence to the proper authorities, and did not tend to keep the quarrel open. Presumably Persons was only forwarding, at the request of others, the best information he could obtain from distant England. He wrote in good faith it is true, but not in good taste or with his usual good judgment. Numerous documents survived to attest the truth of the bulk of his allegations, but his occasional exaggerations tell heavily against him, and he should not have lent his pen to either side in the dispute.

truth of which the Jesuits have experienced to their cost, especially at this period.

In making these investigations, we have certainly travelled away from our immediate subject, the disturbances that accompanied the Benedictine vocations at Valladolid. But we have not really gone far from them, or taken a single step, I trust, that will not help towards surveying the subject better. We have been considering the more important influences, which cannot but have affected subordinate events, and we have perhaps got nearer to a solution of the intrinsic difficulties of the case, than we could have done by confining our inquiries to the particular facts in question. The outbreak at Valladolid reads exactly like the sudden discharge of feelings long kept in, the unpremeditated taking shape of vague conceptions that had been floating in the mental atmosphere, the ideas of the day finding unlooked-for expression in those who had imbibed them, they knew not how or when. If this be so, then the most important part of our task is accomplished, when we have shown that ideas were widely current then which will account for a sudden and otherwise almost inexplicable *denouement*. Some other facts connected with the troubles at Valladolid shall be discussed in a future article.

J. H. POLLEN.



## *A Point of Apologetic.*

---

### III.

ASSUMING still that the facts collected and arranged by experimental science in favour of the hypothesis are such as to demand some kind of Evolution-philosophy; assuming that the very imperfect serial classification of living things according to their degree of organic definiteness, coherence, and heterogeneity not merely represents a variety which has always coexisted since life was possible on this earth, but rather traces out or hints at the genetic process by which this variety has been produced, let us see if there be any other governing principle directing the process more intelligible than the persistence of that mere organic life which cannot even be thought of as distinct from those appliances and functions which it is supposed to have evolved for its own service by "natural selection."

Let us admit what is really evident, that life is nothing distinct from the sum of those functions which minister to the preservation of life; and that therefore it is not the same thing in a man and in a mud-turtle. Man's superior faculties are not merely a more complicated machinery for producing an identical effect which the mud-turtle produces more simply and abundantly, but rather by their very play *constitute* an entirely different and higher kind of life. When Hume, in his *Treatise on Human Nature*, says: "Reason is and ought to be the slave of the passions and can never pretend to any other office than to serve and obey them," he implies that the exercise of reason is no constituent factor of human life, but something outside it, subordinate to it, whereas that life itself consists in passion, or pleasurable sensation, of which man, in virtue of his reason and other advantages, secures more than do his fellow-animals. This is just the conception of life which we have seen to be incoherent on close inspection, and if it be so, then the evolutionary process is a struggle not for bare life or existence, but for the prevalence of the higher kinds of life and existence; and intelligence and morality are not only

co-operative as instruments in maintaining and extending human life, but are themselves the principal elements of that complex life. True, the mind does minister to the body and preserve it; but still more does the body minister to the mind; or rather, each ministers to that whole in which the play of the mind is the principal function and the play of the body subordinate. If, then, we hold to the verdict of our common sense, and regard our mental life not as subordinate to our sensitive and vegetal life, but as co-ordinate and even superior, we must (so to speak) view it as no less "for its own sake," as no less an "end in itself" than they are, but rather much more; we must regard evolution as making for the life of truth and the life of righteousness even more principally than for bare existence or animal vitality. It is now no longer mere life that tries to assert itself, and in the struggle shapes things to what they are; but it is the very highest kind of life, that is trying to come to the birth. Nature inherently tends to the higher through the lower forms of life, and these minister to the higher and receive in return from them the means of a yet more efficacious ministry.

In this conception, every function of the organism has two aspects, under one of which it is its own end and exists for its own sake as an element of the life of the whole; under the other it is ministerial, serving other functions above and below it, as it in return is served by them. Correspondence with the environment is, similarly, not merely a condition of life, but also that wherein vitality principally consists. "Living" is spontaneous self-adaptation to surrounding reality, taken in the very widest sense. The more diverse and multiform this adaptability, the fuller and higher is the life; and thus our ordinary common-sense classifications are justified. Each new manifestation of life means some new correspondence with surrounding reality as we pass from mere vegetation, and then add local movement, and one sense after another, till we come finally to intelligence and the life of reason and right-doing which again consists in self-conformation to things as they really are. In all this we are in agreement with common sense and common language, which identify the fullest life with the fullest activity; all activity being of the nature of response to stimulus, that is, correspondence to reality. As soon as consciousness supervenes on the lower forms of life it is evident that the pleasures of sight, hearing, taste, mind, and affection

all depend on and consist in the consciousness of this successful accommodation of the subject to the object ; and that all pain and disease is simply the felt failure of such adaptation. What was anciently and very wisely called the "natural appetite" of living creatures is in this view nothing else but their response to the modifying attraction exerted upon them by the objective Reality which presses upon them on every side, and tends to draw them into conformity with itself so far as they have latent capacity for such a correspondence. It is the light that makes (or rather elicits) sight ; and it is sound that develops the sense of hearing ; and it is the ideas embodied in Nature that call our intellect into play. Hence it follows that desire for truth and justice, for society and for religion, which assert themselves as invariably in the soul of man at certain stages of progress, as the desire for mere life asserts itself from the first, is simply the felt result of the as yet unsuccessful endeavour of Nature to draw man into a fuller kind of correspondence with herself.

Thus conceived, the course of evolution is comparable, not as before, to the gradual unveiling of a blank canvas revealing simply a greater extent of the same appearance, but to the gradual unveiling of a picture whose full unity of meaning is held in suspense till the disclosure is completed. We do not now interpret the higher by the lower, but the lower by the higher ; the beginning by the end. This may seem perilously near to finalism, yet it is no more necessarily so, than the process of photography ; we only need a self-adaptive tendency in life-matter responsive to the stimulating-tendency of the environment. Not, of course, that this bundle of words really explains anything, but that like other formulæ of the kind, it prescinds from the question of ends and origins, by making a statement of what happens serve as a cause of what happens, and calling it a Law or a Tendency, or a Latent Potentiality—thus filling the gap which mere agnosticism creates in our thought.

With this conception of Evolution our ordinary estimates of "higher" and "lower" are saved ; also the value of our mental processes upon which rests whatever proof the theory may admit of ; while the "argument from adaptability" is provided with a firm basis independent of finality. All our "natural" as opposed to our personal and self-determined appetites or cravings ; those which are, so to say, constitutional and inseparable from our nature in certain conditions, are

evidence of the influence of some reality outside us seeking to draw us into more perfect correspondence with itself, and whose nature can be more or less dimly conjectured from the nature of those cravings. What are called "natural religions" represent man's self-devised attempts to explain the reality answering to his religious and moral cravings. Revelation is but a divine interpretation of the same; as though one with dim vision were to supplement his defect by the testimony of another more clear-sighted.

It may be practically admitted that no philosophy allows of strict demonstration, since being a conception of the totality of things it modifies our understanding of every principle by which one might attempt to prove or disprove it. Eventually it is its harmony with the totality of things as we perceive them that determines us to accept it, and no two of us perceive just the same totality, however substantial an agreement there may be in our experience; yet I think it can hardly be denied that this conception of evolution is far more in agreement with the world as most of us know it, and commonly think and speak of it, than the former; that it not merely satisfies our intellect, but offers some satisfaction to our whole spiritual nature. "Is it certain," asks Mr. Bradley, in a fairly similar connection, "that the mere intellect can be self-satisfied if the other elements of our nature remain uncontented?" And, again: "A result, if it fails to satisfy our whole nature, comes short of perfection; and I could not rest tranquilly in a truth if I were compelled to regard it as hateful. . . . I should insist that the inquiry was not yet closed and that the result was but partial. And if metaphysics" [for which we may substitute: any philosophy, such as that of Evolution] "is to stand, it must, I think, take account of all sides of our being. I do not mean that every one of our desires must be met by a promise of particular satisfaction; for that would be absurd and utterly impossible. But if the main tendencies of our nature do not reach consummation in the Absolute, we cannot believe that we have attained to perfection and truth."<sup>1</sup> From this point of view there can be no doubt as to which of these conceptions of Evolution is the more rational and satisfactory; that which would explain it by a simple tendency in living matter to persist and spread, and would see in all organic variety only the selected means to that somewhat colourless end; or that conception which would explain it

<sup>1</sup> *Appearance and Reality.*

by a tendency in living matter to come into ever fuller correspondence with its environment, seeing in such spontaneous correspondence the very essence of life, and not merely a condition of life.

We need only add a few criticisms on this second conception.

1. It is true that every creature struggles more intensely and vigorously for the lower kind of life, or for "mere life," as we might say, than for any of those things which alone would seem to make life worth the having. But this only means that to live at all is the most fundamental condition of living well and fully and enjoyably. The higher life cannot stand without the lower, which it includes, but the lower is not therefore the better, nor is it the end for whose sake the higher is desirable; but conversely. Not until men have got bread enough to eat will they have leisure or energy to spare for the less animal grades of vitality. When the means of bodily subsistence grow scarce, then the faculties that were previously set free to seek the bread of a higher and fuller life are diverted to the struggle for bare animal existence; and progress is thrown back; but when there is abundance for all, secured by the labour of a few from whom the remainder can buy, then fuller life becomes once more possible for that remainder. The struggle for bodily food gives an advantage to, and "selects" naturally, those mental and other powers which facilitate its attainment; but just as man does not only eat and labour in order to live, but also (however it may shock conventional ethics) lives in order to eat and labour; so the new energies called forth by competition do not merely secure that grade of life in whose interests they are evoked and perfected, but extend the sphere of vitality, in so much as their own play adds a new element to life and gives it a new form.

The part played by struggle and competition in this process of Evolution is naturally exaggerated by those who deny any latent tendency other than that of mere persistence in being; who repudiate an internal expansiveness towards fuller kinds of existence, drawn out or checked by the environment.

Competition plays a prominent part when there is question of the lower grades of life in so far as these depend on a pabulum that is limited in quantity. In such cases competition within certain limits will secure the bringing-out of latent powers by which the lower level of life is maintained and a

higher level entered upon; the lower being secured by the superimposition of the higher.

But how does it do so? Not by creating anything, but by giving the victory to those individuals who already were ahead of their fellows in virtue of a fuller development of their nature from within; in clearing the ground for them and letting them increase and multiply.

2. Again, we should notice that development in one direction may be at the cost of development in another. The struggle for any lower form of existence than that already attained, is inevitably at the cost of the higher. The degrading effects of destitution are proverbial. Craft, cruelty, selfishness, and all the vices needed for success in a gladiatorial contest are often the fruits of such competition. Also, commercial progress seems on the whole to be at the expense of progress in art and the higher tastes, sacrificing everything to the production of the greatest possible quantity of material comforts. If it sharpens the wits and sensibilities in some directions, it blunts them in others.

Now, the first sense suggested to us in these days by the word "progress," is material progress—all that came in with steam; and this narrow conception vitiates much of our reasoning. It is in this realm undoubtedly that competition is such a factor of rapid advance; but we forget that the food of what the best men have ever considered the best life, is not limited or divisible; but like the light and air is undiminished how many soever share it. Whatever advance there has been in the life of the mind and of the higher tastes and sensibilities, cannot directly be explained by competition, but simply by the quiet upward working of Nature's inherent forces. We look with scorn at the unprogressive East, satisfied that there can be no progress, no life worth living, where there is no rush for dollars. But I think we have yet to learn the meaning of *ex Oriente lux*.

Much of our immorality and our social evil comes from the fact that those who have developed the faculties of a higher grade of life, seek the lower as an end in itself, and not simply so far as it is a condition of the higher and no further. The Gospel precept, as usual, enunciates only the law of reason and nature, when it bids us: "Seek first the Kingdom of God and its justice," that is, to put our best life in the front, and to make it the measure and limit of any other quest. The neglect of

this principle gives us high living and plain thinking, instead of "high thinking and plain living;" and takes the bread out of the mouths of the poor. The competition for pleasures and luxuries and amusements, may indeed develop certain industries and cause progress in certain narrow lines, but it is at the cost of the only progress worth the name.

The conflict between this "struggle-theory" and ethics has been freely acknowledged by Professor Huxley and others; every attempt to educe unselfishness from selfishness has failed. The moral man even in our day has rather a bad time of it; what chance would he have had of surviving to propagate his species in the supposed pre-moral states of human society? Who can possibly conceive mere rottenness being cured by progress in rottenness; or a man drinking himself into temperance? On the other, it is at least conceivable that in the wildest savage there is some little seed of a moral sense—weak, compared with the lowest springs of action, just because it is the highest and therefore only struggling into being; and that in the slow lapse of time events may here and there prove that honesty is the best policy; and that honesty once tasted may be found not only useful for other things but agreeable for itself; and may be cherished and strengthened by social and religious sanctions.

There is, however, a reaction on foot which tends to reconcile the breach between ethics and evolution, by reducing the part played by competition within reasonable bounds, and making it subservient to the survival, not of the most selfish, but of the most social individuals. Definite variation from within, modified between narrow limits by accidental variation from without, is coming to be acknowledged as the chief factor of progress. But we should not forget that to allow an internal principle of orderly development is not merely to modify the popular evolution theory by a slight concession to its adversaries; but it is rather to make it no longer the supreme explanation of development, but at most a slight modification of the more mysterious theory which it was its boast and merit to have supplanted. According to Geddes and Foster and others of their school, it is the species-sub-serving qualities that Nature selects; and these in the higher grades of life are equivalent to the altruistic, social, and ethical qualities. It is in virtue of the parental and maternal instincts of self-sacrifice, self-diffusion, self-forgetfulness in the interests of the offspring, that species are preserved and prevail. Selfish egoism leads eventually (as we



see in some modern countries where *laissez-faire* liberalism prevails) to social disruption, decadence, and chaos; and this is the universal law of life in every grade. At first indeed the unit struggles to live, for life is the condition of propagation, but the root of this instinct is altruistic; it is the whole asserting itself in the part; and all "self-regarding" instincts are to be likewise explained as subordinate to the "other-regarding" instincts. As soon as this subordination is ignored in practice, regress takes the place of progress. The transit, we are told, from the unicellular to the multi-cellular organism cannot be explained by individualism, but implies a diminution of the competitive, an increase of the social and subordinative tendency. The argument from economics to biology and back again, is said to be nearing exposure; the "progress of the species through the internecine struggle of its individuals at the margin of subsistence," is the outgoing idea. Yes, and with it goes out all that made Evolution a simple and therefore popular explanation of the world; and there comes in that "organic" conception of the process which clamours for theism and finalism as its only coherent complement.

3. But though Evolution so conceived makes the "argument from adaptability," as well as the arguments for theism, stronger rather than weaker; we must not shut our eyes to the difficulty created by the fact (too little insisted upon by Evolutionists) that there is no solid reason for thinking that progress is all-pervading. We have already said that progress in commerce may be regress in art or in religion or in morality. Also, progress in benevolence may co-exist with regress in fortitude and purity; progress in one point of morality with regress in another; progress in ethical judgment with regress in ethical practice. And in every realm, growth and decay, life and death, seem so to intertwine and oscillate that it is very gratuitous to designate the total process as being one or the other. Spencer confesses that the entire universe oscillates between extremes of integration and disintegration. Why we should consider the universe at present to be rising rather than falling, waxing rather than waning, one cannot say. The easier presumption is that it is equally one and the other, and always has been. Even were we rash enough to pronounce progress to be on the whole prevalent within the narrow field of our own experience, surely it were nothing but the inevitable "provincialism" of the human mind to pass *per saltum* from



that, to a generalization for all possible experience. Our optimism, our faith that right, truth, and order will eventually prevail, can find only a delusive basis in actual experience, and must draw its life from some deeper source.

Why then should we so presume that our moral and religious ideas are really progressive and not regressive, as to regard their interpretation as approximating to the truth? The answer is simply that our argument from adaptability does not require the assumption in question, but only that we should be able to distinguish higher from lower tendencies, progressive from regressive movements, without holding the optimistic view that on the whole the forward tendency is at present prevailing. It is not because we live in the nineteenth century that we consider our moral perceptions truer than those of the ancient Hebrews, but because we at once comprehend and transcend their ideas (in some respects), as the greater does the less. In many points surely the relation is inverted and we feel ourselves transcended (or may at least suspect it), by those who lived or live in ruder conditions than our own. David has perhaps taught us more than we could have taught him; and there are other vices than those proper to semi-barbarism. It is not by reference to date or country, or grade of material progress, that we assess the value of moral judgments, but by that subjective standard with which our own moral attainments supply us in regard to all that is equal or less; similar or dissimilar. To deny this discernment is to throw the doors open to unqualified scepticism; to admit it, is all that we need for the validity of our inference.

4. If Evolution is really of this oscillatory character; if at all times much the same processes have been going on in different parts of this universe as now—one system decaying as another is coming into being; is it not more reasonable to imagine (for it is only a question of imagining) that the primordial datum was not uniform nebula, but matter in all stages of elaboration from the highest to the lowest—the same sort of result as we should get from a cross-section at any subsequent moment in the process? What reason is there for assuming primordial homogeneity, since every backward step would show us, together with the unravelling of what is now in process of weaving, a counterbalancing weaving of what is now in process of disintegration? Were this earth all, we might dream of universal advance by shutting our eyes to a great many incompatible facts; but when

our telescopes show us the co-existence of integration and disintegration everywhere, what can we conclude but that in the past as in the future, no alteration is to be looked for beyond the shifting of the waves' crest from side to side of the sea of matter—the total ratio of depressions to elevations remaining exactly constant.

Were the other view of an original universal homogeneity correct, how comes it that we have still co-existent every stage of advance from the lowest to the highest, and that there is not a greater equality?—a difficulty which does not exist if we suppose things to have been *on the whole*, as they are now, from the very first. But whichever view we take; whether we suppose all things collectively to oscillate between recurring extremes of "sameness" and "otherness;" or every stage of the wave of progress from crest to trough, to be simultaneously manifested in the universe at all times, the old difficulty of "the beginning" will force itself upon us. A process *ab æterno* is at least as unimaginable as the process of creation *ex nihilo*; if it be not altogether inconceivable to boot. And the alternative is either a primordial state of homogeneous matter which contains the present cosmos in germ, and from which it is evolved without the aid of any environment—such a germ claiming a designer as much as any ready-made perfect world; or else, a primordial state of things like that which we should get at any cross-section of the secular process, in which every stage of life and death, growth and decay, evolution and involution, is represented as now. This would include fossils and remains of past civilizations which (in the hypothesis) would never have existed; and would be in all respects as difficult as the crudest conception of the creation-hypothesis. And if this absurdity drives us back to primordial homogeneity, as before, we must remember that here, too, though not so evidently, we should have all the signs of an antecedent process that was non-existent. Life and death, corruption and integration, are parts of one undulatory process. Cut the wave where you will its curve claims to be finished in both directions and suggests a before as well as an after. If, in the very nature of things, the pendulum sways between confusion and order, chaos and cosmos, each extreme intrinsically demands the other, not only as its consequent, but as its antecedent; and the first chaos, no less than any succeeding one, will seem the ruin of a previous cosmos. Therefore we are driven back upon a process

*ab æterno* with every stage of evolution always simultaneously represented in one part or other of the whole. Whatever mitigation such a conception may offer, surely we may be excused for still adhering to that simpler explanation which involves a mystery indeed, but nothing so positively unthinkable as a process without a beginning.

5. This same conception of a process without beginning, favours the notion that since life was possible on our globe all species may well have co-existed in varying proportions. From the sudden spread of population through almost accidental conditions, we can imagine how certain species might have been so scarce as to leave no trace in geological strata, whereas those which enormously preponderated at the same time would have done so. A change of conditions might easily cause the former to preponderate, and their sudden appearance in the strata would look as though they had then first come into being. In a word, we can have good evidence for the extinction of species, but scarcely any for their origination.

This supposition is not adverse to the derivation of species from a common stock, but rather favours the notion that as in the case of the individual the period of plasticity is short compared with that of morphological stability, so if there was such an arboreal branching out of species from a common root, it took place rapidly in conditions as different from ours as those of uterine from extra-uterine life; and that the stage of inflexibility may have been reached before any time of which we have record.

But in truth when we see in the world of chemical substances an altogether similar seriation of species where there can be no question of common descent as its cause, we may well suspend our judgment till the established facts have excluded the many hypotheses other than Evolution by which they may be explained.

As long as Evolution claims to be no more than a working scientific hypothesis, like ether or electric fluid—a sort of frame or subjective category into which observed facts are more conveniently fitted, it cannot justly be pressed for a solution of ultimate problems; but when it claims to be a complete philosophy and as such to extrude other philosophies previously in possession, it must show that it can rest the mind where they leave it restless; or that it has proved their proffered solutions spurious. This, so far, it has absolutely failed to do. At most it may determine more accurately the way in which God works

out His Idea in Creation. It can stand as long as it is content to prescind from the question of ends and origins ; but then it is no longer a complete philosophy. As soon as it attempts to solve those problems it becomes incoherent and unthinkable. Its true complement is theism and finality, which flow from it as naturally, if not quite so immediately as the "argument from adaptability." *Deus creavit* is so far the only moderately intelligible, or at least not demonstrably unintelligible, answer given to the problem of *In principio*.

We have then in this second and soberer form of the philosophy of Evolution, an attempt to explain the order of the universe without explicit recourse to the hypothesis of an intelligent authorship and government of the world ; that is to say, independently of theism and finality ; and so far as this explanation admits all the effects and consequences of an intelligent government, without ascribing them to that cause, it admits among their number the value of the "argument from adaptability," and allows us to infer that the postulates of man's higher moral needs correspond approximately to reality, of which they are in some sense the product ; and that the "wish to believe" is less likely to be a source of delusion in proportion as the belief in question is higher in the moral scale.

But it is also clear how unsuccessful this attempted philosophy is in many ways ; and with what difficulties and mysteries it is burdened. At best it can prescind from finalism by a confession of incompleteness and philosophical bankruptcy ; by resolutely refusing to face the problem of the whole—of the ultimate whence and whither. If it would positively exclude theism or finalism it must ascribe all seeming order and adaptation to the persistence of some blind force, subduing all things to itself, to "existence," or to "life" striving to assert and extend itself. It is this conception that seems best to bring the mystery of the universe within the comprehension of the popular mind ; and is more in keeping with those "aggregation theories" of our day which regard dust as the one eternal reality whose combinations and disguises delude us into believing in soul and intelligence and divinity. But on closer examination the words "life" and "existence" answer to no simple reality or force which can be regarded as governing nature, and from this radical fallacy of language a whole brood of further absurdities spring up which make the popular form of Evolution-philosophy utterly incoherent.

G. TYRRELL.

## *Nineteenth Century Christians.*

---

[This article is not written from the standpoint of a Catholic magazine ; but we are pleased to insert it as raising an interesting question which sometimes perplexes earnest minds. Later we shall offer some comments of our own on the subject.—*Editorial.*]

---

As a people, we hate cant. Generally speaking, we have an aversion to all swagger, boasting, and the proclaiming of our own virtues. When a victorious General is received at Dover with every civic and military form of welcome and honour, we like to recognize our hero in an unassuming figure, wearing a tweed suit and a bowler hat. The Heir to the throne is never more popular than when in homely garb he may be seen pinching and punching some prize animal at an agricultural show. Our greatest nobles often pass on to the next world without having been even measured for a coronet. But there is one remarkable exception to this rule: we all insist on being called by the highest title of all; we are very tenacious of the name of Christian; we are never tired of repeating that this is a Christian country; no nation is so aggressively Christian; no other nation is so touchy about its Christianity as we are; we almost claim a monopoly; no print is so popular as the one that shows Her Majesty presenting a feather-adorned negro with a copy of the Bible, and assuring him that this is the source of England's greatness. When we read that a young man, walking with his sweetheart in broad daylight in the frequented street of a great city, is set upon gratuitously by a gang of roughs, and then and there promptly kicked to death, we hold up our hands in horror, because we boast ourselves to be not merely a civilized, but a "Christian" nation. It is true that the word is sometimes used with a special significance; but this, most of us dislike. People engaged in religious propaganda will address to a stranger the embarrassing question—"Are you a Christian?" in a tone we are apt to resent. Occasionally, a man of well-known piety is spoken of as a "truly" Christian man.

But it is not with any special meaning of the word that we are here concerned; only with that sense in which alone the epithet may logically be used. Surely, there must be a definite meaning to the word "Christian" from which escape or evasion is impossible; a meaning which the man or the community claiming the title is bound to accept. What is this meaning? Apart from religious dogma, apart from the conscientious belief or disbelief of the inquirer, apart from the virtue or the vileness of his own life, what is the *least* that is at any rate implied by the word "Christian"?

On the face of it, the question appears too simple to be worth much consideration; but the ordinary standard of the ordinary Christian shows that the question cannot be quite so simple as it looks. In other religions it is simpler. Those who have any acquaintance with Jewish life know that in whatever part of the world you meet this ancient people, you find them acknowledging practically the same rule of life; so too with Mohammedans, whether on the West Coast of Africa or in the heart of India, when you mix with them you cannot help recognizing that their foundations of belief are identical, and do form the chief factors that influence their daily life: and this, not as to outward observances only, but as cogent motives of action.

Johnson's Dictionary defines "A Christian" to be "A professor of the religion of Christ." Johnson's definitions do generally embody common-sense; a better definition of "A Christian" cannot easily be suggested. Is the man in the street usually "a professor of the religion of Christ"? Are we, as a nation, "professors of the religion of Christ"? The natural answer is "yes;" so long as this profession be subjected to no definite test. And here it is well to emphasize the word "professor;" according to our definition it is not essential to act up to this profession; to be a professor only, is to be a Christian, and herein Dr. Johnson is right, because the moment you allow that falling short of your profession is to be a disqualification, you disqualify every one; all fall short. But every man is bound to try to act up to his profession, whatever it be. Bacon says, "I hold every man a debtor to his profession, from the which as men of course do seek to receive countenance and profit, so ought they of duty to endeavour themselves by way of amends to be a help and ornament thereunto."

What is this religion of Christ, which we profess? Where

are we to seek it? What is our authority for it? There are three sources of information: the words of Christ Himself; the recollections of His companions; and the writings of St. Paul who never saw Him on earth, but was in close and intimate contact with those who had known Him, and lived in His company. For all practical purposes, most Christians accept these three sources, as of equal value; but still, the very words of the Teacher Himself must always carry more weight than those of even His most trusted followers. How far the New Testament may be taken as a sure guide to the religion of Christ, is a momentous question; but, as those who profess themselves Christians do almost all acknowledge the New Testament to be an authentic compendium, and the only compendium, of the religion of Christ, it may be so accepted here.

To point out the inconsistencies of professing Christians would be an easy task; we are not now concerned to see in what respect Christian practice conflicts with Christ's precepts; but rather wherein does Christian profession differ from Christ's directions to Christians. We are not inquiring what Christians do, but what Christians profess; what is the generally accepted ideal for all Christians, and how far does it agree with the ideal set forth by Christ? The broad scheme of life sketched out by Christ is harmonious; one part does not contradict another; and it is about as unpopular a programme as a statesman could devise. Broadly speaking, it is a life of self-sacrifice and deep humility. Some of the directions seem so outrageous that they are commonly explained away, or are said to be impracticable, suitable only for an Oriental race, for a warm climate, or for the centuries of long ago; at any rate, quite incompatible with railways, telegraphs, and nineteenth century civilization. These are strange reasons for ignoring plain precepts, which must have been quite as unpopular and "impracticable" when first delivered, as they are now. This ignoring of plain precepts is a Christian characteristic; it is not an avowed characteristic of any other religion. Let us consider one or two of these precepts about which there can be no doubt.

First, let us observe maxims from Christ's own lips. See the unqualified exhortations to extreme humility. "Whosoever would become great among you, shall be your servant; and whosoever would be first among you shall be bond-servant."



"If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet; for I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you." "When thou art bidden go and sit down in the lowest place." And then see what His followers have to say about this, although, on more than one occasion, they lamentably failed to practise it: "In lowliness of mind, let each esteem other better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." "Walk with all lowliness and meekness." "Put on therefore humbleness of mind, meekness." "Gird yourself with humility to serve one another." "Let us go forth, therefore, unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach."

Now the question is not, how far do we practise the principle, but, how far do we receive it? How far do we accept this attitude of deep humility as the recognized ideal that the ordinary, every-day Christian, the man on the top of a 'bus, ought at least to keep before him, however much he may fall short of it in practice? And how far do we look for such humility in those of our fellow-men whom we venerate and regard as consistent followers of Christ, and whose example we extol to one another? Viewing broadly our social system, the usual relations that exist between masters and servants; between manufacturers and their "hands;" between officers in the Navy and Army and their men; and generally between employers and the employed; do we say that personal humility on Christ's model might and ought to obtain among all classes? Of course, the man in any condition of life who proclaims that he has been insulted, and that he stands up for his right; who rather boasts of being touchy; who tells you he "has his feelings;" who complains that he has not been treated with proper respect; obviously does not accept the Christian ideal, which demands a degree of humility quite incompatible with such sentiments.

We English have a hearty dislike of cant, and contempt of all that savours of cant; it excites disgust to see a man making a great profession of religion, and leading a life at variance with that profession; and so, as we all find it difficult to live quite up to our profession, we take comfort by lowering our standard just a little, that our profession and our practice may not be quite so obtrusively at variance. Is this an adequate reason for lowering the Christian standard? Is not this charge of inconsistency

exactly that "reproach" of the outcast from the camp which St. Paul refers to, and which we are really too cowardly to face?

Another precept urged by Christ Himself is continual self-sacrifice, which, among other forms of self-denial, is apparently to include the divesting oneself of earthly possessions to some extent, and possibly altogether. "Sell that ye have and give alms." "Go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and come, take up the cross and follow me." "Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth." "Whosoever doth not bear his cross cannot be my disciple." Pretty plain speaking, this. And what have His followers to say on the subject? "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above." "Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." "He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves." "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." "We ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."

Community of goods and indiscriminate almsgiving have not proved a success, even in the first century at Jerusalem, but neither has the possession of great wealth. More than once Christ commented on the serious dangers of wealth. But does one ever, by chance, hear one word of sympathy for a rich man, on the ground of the danger of his wealth, as we certainly should hear were he in any other danger? Is there any known instance of the prayers of the congregation being desired for a person in great danger through the sudden acquisition of wealth? Although of the reality of the danger, the experience of every middle-aged man will furnish instances. Christ's warnings of the danger are so emphatic and explicit, that, in the mouth of any one else, they would be termed exaggerated. Commentators, confronted by the warning, "It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God," find it an awkward passage to tackle; and so they tell us a great deal that is interesting about what is meant by a camel, and the reference to a gate at Jerusalem known as "The needle's eye;" they might as well tell us that a camel is the name actually used in Holland for a pontoon, and that it would require some seamanship to navigate her through the Needles.

It is rather startling sometimes to hear one who is a professor of the religion of Christ inquire whether there is any

harm in betting or gambling; indeed, a well-known philanthropic Duke declares there is none. In 1895 it was even thought necessary to publish a little book, *The Ethics of Gambling*, to oppose what Mr. Gladstone, in the preface, described as "the false, destructive, and shall I say impious principle on which the vice of gambling is radically founded." If we are seeking another's wealth and not our own, how can we wish to take another person's money from him by betting? And yet it does not seem to strike any one as extraordinary that in a Christian country the judges of the highest courts in the land are called upon gravely to decide what is meant by "a place" where betting shall or shall not be lawful. Fancy a professor of the religion of Christ being invited to puzzle over such a question as that. Why, the question of "the washing of pots and cups," which so engrossed the minds of the Scribes and Pharisees, and were so scathingly denounced by Christ, was nothing to this.

Our ordinary recognized standard of commercial morality is singularly low for a community priding itself on the name of Christian; and this, not merely among commercial men, but among all classes. The Christian religion is essentially a religion of giving, not a religion of getting; but this is far from being our usual creed; professional men exact commissions; the titled classes and public men secretly accept money with directorships; men seek public offices to advance their private interests; but they all suffer very little, if at all, in public estimation; and in the exceedingly common event of the sale of a horse, it is notorious that the one does not seek the other's wealth, but simply and purely his own; to suggest a Christian standard of common "honesty" in horse-dealing would be held the *reductio ad absurdum* of Christianity. It is not strange that these things are so; what is strange is that the men who do them claim, and are readily granted, the title of Christian. Are we not content to take our Christianity pretty much as we do our golden trinkets, which are usually hollow, and invariably alloyed? Is there any demand for twenty-carat Christianity?

Every few years the country is rent and distracted by a General Election: the question of the hour is some measure of home or of foreign policy: it is generally one of the very first importance: it may affect our character as a nation in the eyes of the civilized world; or it may be some social question on which depends the welfare of thousands of our fellow-country-

men. Now, if ever, is the moment to be guided by the principles of the religion of Christ, which we are so careful, individually and nationally, to profess: but do we find these principles either openly avowed or obviously underlying the speeches and publications of the contending parties? Is not selfishness too often propounded as the guiding principle of international politics? Is truth advocated in international diplomacy, and is every departure from it sternly reprobated by this Christian country? Or if it be some question of social legislation, do we seek "every man another's wealth"? Do the Rich seek to give to the Poor a fair share of the privileges and opportunities they themselves enjoy, whether of education, of leisure, of health, or of intellectual or artistic enjoyment? And those who raise their voices at Election times, whether in the pulpit or on the platform, are they bent on applying to the question of the hour the principles of the religion of Christ, fearlessly, with no uncertain sound? Do we all, or do we not, eagerly take this opportunity to measure our policy by Christ's standard?

Christ declares the daily cross to be an essential condition of discipleship. His followers tell us that for our bodies to be a living sacrifice is only our reasonable service, and that the Christian must crucify the flesh. Both the advantage and the duty of habitual self-denial are strongly insisted on. Do we generally, for ourselves, recognize this duty? Or is it only from men of saintly lives that we expect that habit of daily self-sacrifice, which is distinctly enjoined upon *all* "professors of the religion of Christ"? Self-sacrifice is the most powerful weapon of the High Churchman and of the Roman Catholic; it is the main strength of the Salvation Army; it made heroes of the dervishes in the Sudan, who fearlessly faced slaughter by machinery. In the unfortunate absence of persecution, self-sacrifice furnishes the next strongest impulse to holy living. Without self-sacrifice nobility of spirit cannot exist; personal ease is fatal to it. Even Christ Himself was made "perfect through sufferings."

Christ inculcated a life of continual watchfulness and prayer, and charged His followers to aim at a standard of life so high as to be practically unattainable; He did not mince matters at all; He placed before His disciples a model of life which He knew they could never reach, but they were to be satisfied with nothing less. "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst

after righteousness, for they shall be filled. Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." "Men ought always to pray, and not to faint." "Watch ye therefore, and pray always." "Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation." Any progress at all in the direction of the perfection insisted on, could only be made by a life of ceaseless watchfulness and prayer. His immediate followers recognized this to the full. "Only let your manner of life be worthy of the Gospel of Christ." "As he which called you is holy, be ye yourselves also holy in all manner of living." "Seeing that these things are thus all to be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy living and godliness; continue in prayer, and watch in the same." "I will therefore that men pray everywhere." "Pray without ceasing." "Praying always, with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance."

Is this manner of life now the recognized manner of life which forms the ideal of the average Christian? Is it the manner of life habitually urged upon him by his religious teachers? Because the standard of ordinary and average life set before us is so high, do we therefore try to get as near it as we can, individually or nationally, by the manner of life enjoined, or do we deliberately agree to accept a much lower standard of action? If the latter, we may be very good heathens, or agnostics, but surely we do not propose to label ourselves Christians, do we? Can the Christian religion accept any lower standard than the one given by Christ?

How can we expect progress towards the perfection held up to us if we ignore this necessity for continual watchfulness and prayer? The strain of the high civilization of the day gives a weight to this precept now which it had not nineteen centuries ago. And yet no one can pretend that the monastic life devoted literally to perpetual prayer, solved the question of Christian living.

We are not concerned with the inconsistencies of Christian practice; only with the question of what is Christian profession; but still we cannot ignore that, besides those who preach with their lips, there are those who preach by their example, and cannot help so doing. Sermons and speeches are not always rightly apprehended, but no one can misunderstand the preaching of the statesman who, not caring to grasp wealth and rank within his reach, is content with the reward of honour, and duty

done: that preaching is not lost upon a nation. When Charles Kingsley brought his young men to play cricket on his rectory lawn on Sunday afternoon he preached, and he meant to preach, by his example; and his preaching was not lost. Neither is the preaching of the prelate, who appears on State occasions in a gorgeous coach, with powdered footmen and bewigged coachmen, and the trappings of worldly wealth and greatness. He preaches to the bystanders how he interprets the injunctions of Christ to extreme personal humility. Some of those who have done noblest Christian work have been inveterate smokers and men of portly habit. Again, we are not concerned here with practice; only with precept. But self-indulgent ways deliberately and publicly practised by prominent men become precepts; they proclaim in effect that such habits are believed to be quite consistent with crucifying the flesh, and keeping our bodies in the condition of a living sacrifice. They are not mere inconsistencies to be lamented, or regrettable lapses from a recognized higher standard; they are a deliberate pronouncement that a certain degree of mere self-indulgence is allowable to the professor of the religion of Christ. Such preaching is not lost upon the community. It is sometimes made the excuse for a very uncertain degree of self-indulgence.

It would almost seem then that we want a new name to signify those who are professors of the religion of Christ. Whatever may have been the case in the past, it is clear that to-day the word "Christian" is *not* confined to those who are professors of the religion of Christ; it avowedly includes many who do not so profess, and even some who dispute that such profession can be genuine, because they maintain that the religion of Christ, as defined by Christ and by His immediate followers, is incompatible with nineteenth century civilization. No body of men can ever be deprived of a title they have once assumed; the queer and quaint atoms that often go to make up what is now called a Christian must be left in possession of the name. But if in due time any considerable body of men agree that the commonly-accepted rule of life ought to be the religion of Christ, as Christ taught it, the needful name will soon be forthcoming; it was by a mere accident that the name given to Christ's followers at Antioch became the accepted name all over the world for those who professed His teaching. It is no question of forming a new Sect, or of inaugurating new practices or ceremonies; it is simply that those who profess to

follow the religion of Christ from all Sects and from all Denominations shall by no consideration be restrained from avowing it; not by the miserable sense of their own shortcomings; not by the fear of cant; not by a shrinking from the living sacrifice. The stone of stumbling and rock of offence, whatever it be, will not be removed, but "whosoever believeth shall not be ashamed."

Total abstainers are prone to exhibit a fragment of blue ribbon to advertise their principles, and this harmless practice is often found to be convenient. Christ foresaw that an outward sign might also be of use to His followers, both for mutual recognition and for outsiders, and He was careful to give them one. "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another." This is the sign of the freemasonry that is to unite all Christians; so, when the man who has secured a comfortable corner-seat in a railway carriage, spontaneously offers it to a fellow-traveller; when one steps up to a stranger to help him with a heavy load; when the nursery-maid saves the lives of her charges in a burning house at the expense of her own; when the stewardess of a sinking ship hands over to a girl-passenger the life-belt she had provided for her own safety, we may recognize a professor of the religion of Christ, even although some appearances may point the other way. Among the very poorest classes of the community, such proofs of love are astonishingly common; it is no unusual thing for an exceedingly poor man to give the half of all he has in the world to another, or to devote to a sick neighbour a night of watching between two days of toil. The particular outward sign of Christianity ordained by Christ, the showing of love one to another, is certainly commonest where love has least to give.

There is still room for the spread of this freemasonry. When the day shall come that all who profess and call themselves Christians shall hold the faith of Christ in unity of spirit and in the bond of peace, we may then expect to advance through a right profession to righteousness of life.

E. V.



## *The Prerogative of Mercy.*

---

THE popular idea upon this, as upon many other matters of state, is somewhat incorrect. As a matter of fact, the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, or even the Secretary of State for Home Affairs (unless he happens to be an exceptional man), has but little to do with its exercise.

When the petition for the remission of a sentence gets to the Home Office, it is first handled by various clerks, who report and advise upon it. These gentlemen touch it with but prentice hands, and a further and presumably better opinion upon the same is subsequently furnished by their elders and superiors. Finally, or all but finally for practical purposes, it is considered by two high officials, who, after taking into consideration the reports of their subordinates, and getting the opinion of experts when necessary, as in capital cases where insanity is alleged, come to a definite conclusion more or less in consonance with the advice so obtained upon the matter at issue. Let it not be supposed for a moment that any one of these officials is other than a competent man intellectually. Probably the only thing that he does not know, in which it is desirable that he should be proficient, in order to come to a right judgment in such cases, is psychology and the other matters which are the peculiar study of the *Medecin Légiste*, and that together make up the science of Criminology. Without such training, the Home Office can only form the opinion that any other intelligent body of laymen would come to, upon a matter concerning which no one of them is necessarily obliged to have any special knowledge or training, having been guided thereto firstly by the judge who tried the case, who himself knows little but law and secondly by medical experts, whose training has been strictly confined to Medicine.

These things being so, what wonder is it that the recent case of Mary Ansell should have presented such insuperable

difficulties to the Home Office and its advisers? Its facts are too well known to need recapitulation. Broadly put, a completely degenerate girl, of bad heredity by sex, with sisters and mother's sisters in asylums, as well as other insane and epileptic ascendants, insured the life of an imbecile sister for £22 10s., and then sent her a cake containing phosphorous paste by post, from eating which presumably the poor imbecile died. Few students of criminology will have any doubt but that this girl was either irresponsible, or only partially responsible, for this act of hers. No doubt she compassed the death of her afflicted sister, in order that she might benefit herself thereby. No glamour or sentiment relieved the sombre sadness of a commonplace poisoning by a relative, under repulsive circumstances. An imbecile was taken advantage of. Poison was used. "That woman was the cause." On what grounds, reasoned judge, jury, and Home Office, can there possibly be found a justification for the exercise of mercy? But we venture to submit that there were grounds to justify a remission of the death-penalty, grounds which as yet do not seem to enter into the purview of our authorities.

First, it is contended that the girl should have been shown to be wholly responsible, before she was held to have merited the death penalty. Is it probable that she was so, there being epilepsy in her family, she being a poor creature herself, and her sisters and aunts all in asylums? *Prima facie*, her responsibility was, from the nature of her antecedent family history, very limited. Secondly, she did an exceptionally cruel act, in a perfectly open manner, for an inadequate consideration, and apparently showed no remorse. Although, according to our English practice, these circumstances alone could hardly be considered sufficiently strong to mitigate the penalty, yet, taken in conjunction with the manifest hereditary limitations of the girl, they not only ought but frequently would be considered sufficient to make the wrong-doer an inmate of Broadmoor, rather than another victim for the scaffold.

For if the marked mental inferiority of a so-called criminal be once, we will not say clearly established, but reasonably inferred, every detail in connection with the execution of the crime itself should surely be most carefully weighed and considered. But this is just what is seldom done, either by the mere lawyer or the mere doctor. The mere doctor attempts feebly to grope about with the view of getting at the antecedent state of mind of the

criminal, and is mainly influenced in his search by such present mental and physical appearances as would be taken into consideration by him, if he were asked to certify a non-criminal patient as insane. But the criminal has committed an outrageous act, while usually the other has not. The lawyer, on the other hand, seldom a great criminal one, has become saturated with the notion of the hypothetical tenant and the typical reasonable man. He marshals the facts of the case, just as if they pointed as of course to murder in the case of a reasonable man. The prisoner (unless he expressly raises the defence of insanity) is in fact assumed to be a reasonable man, and convicted out of hand. This is obviously reasoning in a vicious circle, proceeding as it does from false premisses. The possibility of an injustice of this kind, it is suggested, would be obviated if a *medecin légiste* or criminologist sat as assessor with the judge who tried the case. He would notice when the conduct and appearance of the prisoner appeared abnormal to his practised eye. If, being thus put upon his guard, he afterwards found that the family history of the prisoner was suspicious, he would advise the court that responsibility had to be clearly established by the Crown, before a conviction could properly take place. In this way the onus of proving responsibility would be placed upon the Crown, a very different thing from the present state of the law, which is that, if an offence be proved, the offender is presumed to be responsible until he may show that he is not, to do which would probably cost far more money than he can afford.

It is, indeed, contended by the opponents of the French School of Criminology, whose views we are stating, that, if in such cases the onus of proving responsibility were to be laid on the prosecution, the logical consequence would be, that all members of families with records of this bad kind ought to be locked up until they have succeeded one by one in proving themselves to be sane and responsible agents. But there is no need for a measure so drastic. It might, perhaps, be well to keep such persons under special observation, and that is what in fact we do. But we must run some risks, and may reflect that all lunacy is not homicidal. In the village of Gheel, for instance, in Belgium, where criminal lunatics are boarded out, no dangerous outbreaks occur. In any case we do not protect ourselves against the danger, whatever it may be, from that source, by treating as sane and punishing with death, a

possibly insane person who is accused of murder. And the whole question raised is as to whether, when these suspicious cases of heredity come into court, the tests of insanity are wont to be rightly applied, by laying the burden of proving irresponsibility on the accused, rather than that of proving responsibility on the prosecution.

So far the prerogative of mercy has been glanced at chiefly in capital cases, where its exercise is, as may be reasonably inferred, considered most carefully by the highest available authorities, and usually only upon complete and exhaustive reports. With the principle of its exercise in such cases no one should complain, though they may perhaps with the methods in use, namely, that only the opinion of lawyers and doctors is relied on, and a practical criminologist or *medecin légiste* is not always required to report as well, and such report sufficiently considered. When we come to criminals of a lesser degree, as would naturally be supposed, the process is not so thorough and drastic. Yet even here each case goes through a number of sieves, and is efficiently threshed out upon all such points as appear upon its face. The Home Office obviously has to be set in motion first. This is done by the criminal and his friends, or by the prison doctor, or possibly by a prison Commissioner. Now that one of these is a doctor of eminence, who was previously an examiner for the College of Physicians, we may not unreasonably hope in the near future for better results. But still the whole matter depends to a great degree upon the Treasury, which is as yet unable to allocate adequate funds to the treatment of many hard cases. Of these the saddest are those in which insanity is clearly apparent in a prisoner, when undergoing his sentence.

What is called prison madness, or madness superinduced by solitary confinement, is almost unknown in England, though common in Portugal, where sentences of eight years' solitary confinement are common. But both in England and France a large proportion of prisoners are insane, and this is getting more clearly recognized, owing to our improved methods of prison administration. The problem, of course, is what to do with such as these. It is in the course of being solved by the building of a second Broadmoor, which will receive many poor creatures who are now merely detained in the prison infirmaries. There, although treated with all kindness, they cannot obviously undergo the same curative treatment that they would enjoy

under the supervision of men like Dr. Brayn, Dr. Nicolson, or Dr. Orange. The treatment of lunatics is a speciality which is in the hands of a very few, and the proper treatment of lunatics of a dangerous type cannot be carried out in infirmaries, though it can and is at places like Broadmoor in England, or Villejuif in France.

The case which it has been attempted here to make is, shortly put, that the powers that be look too much at the nature of the crime, and too little at the life history, temperament, and previous surroundings of the criminal. That the revision of sentences takes often too cast-iron a form. That in fact the limitations of the prisoner, and not the advantage of society, should be primarily considered in the application of the prerogative of mercy, which might, as some venture to think, not unseldom be strained in favour of the miserable creature who, *ex hypothesi*, has never had half a chance of understanding the enormity of the transgression that he has committed, or of perfectly apprehending the comparative advantage of doing that only which is lawful and right. In brief, whatever view may be the true one, if due regard be had to the respect in which penal science is at present held on the Continent, the suggestions here tentatively advanced should be with us, too, at this present, well within the range of practical consideration.

A. R. WHITEWAY.

### *St. Rose of Viterbo.*

---

IT was on the 21st of June, 1821, that a youthful student in the Jesuit College at Viterbo, received for the first time the Bread of Life. Seventy-eight years have passed since that to him memorable day, and the boy, who knelt in humble faith before the altar in the old Church of St. Ignatius, now wears the Papal tiara. He is altered in many respects since those far away days spent in the grey-walled city of Viterbo. The earnest piety, the intellectual promise, the boyish ardour of those far-off days, have ripened into the signal endowments of soul and mind which render his Pontificate so remarkable. But there is one trait of his school-boy days which still remains untouched by the hand of time, and that is his devotion to the virgin Saint of Viterbo. One of his most valued possessions at the present time is a beautifully carved silver statue of St. Rose, presented to him, on his accession to the Pontifical throne, by the Bishop, the clergy, and the inhabitants of his native town.

The feast of St. Rose falls on the 4th of the present month. Perhaps, therefore, a brief account of a Saint, under whose special patronage Leo XIII. spent his youth, and of the way in which her *fešta* is kept, may be found not uninteresting.

There is some little difficulty about the date of her death, but we may set it down with Luke Wadding as having occurred in 1251 or 1252. The date of her birth is quite lost, but she died whilst still almost a child, that is to say about the age of seventeen. Not long after her death the body was solemnly translated to the convent which bears her name. The belief in her sanctity has been continuous from the time of her death, but the process of her canonization was not instituted till two hundred years later, under the Pontificate of Callixtus III. The *Acta* of this process are preserved, and the Bollandists have published all save the purely formal portions of them.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Sanctorum*, Sept. 4th.

These consist first of a general account of the facts about her life, which were to form the basis of the judicial inquiry, and then of the *précis* of the miracles which were held to be attested; none, however, of these miracles belong to the Saint's life, but only to her posthumous intercession.

Under the ninth heading in this summary account, we are told that a life based on authentic documents had formerly existed, but had perished in the fire long, apparently, before the time of the process. But the process incorporates another life "by an unknown author," and this unknown author tells us that he has drawn his narrative from certain ancient documents containing the accounts of devout and trustworthy persons who testify that they had seen or heard from Rose's own lips what they tell. Evidently, these ancient documents are those of which the process deplores the loss. To that extent, then, but no further, we are brought, through the unknown author, into relation with the contemporary witnesses, but in what follows we shall simply give the outlines of the life as these authorities have handed it down to us, without criticism, the object being merely to give the only picture we have of a Saint round whom so much devotion has gathered.

Her parents, John and Catherine—the family name is never mentioned by the Saint's biographers—acted as servants to the community of Poor Clares, whose convent adjoined their humble dwelling. St. Rose is said to have been born when they were both advanced in age. Even in the first days of her life she is said to have shown signs of her future sanctity. As soon as she was able to walk her toddling footsteps led her in the direction of the church, where she would remain for hours absorbed in prayer. Her companions in the narrow streets and quaint old courtyards of Viterbo played games of a more or less noisy character, laughed, wept, and quarrelled vociferously, and impressed their personality upon the entire neighbourhood, while the child raised up by God to undertake a special mission prepared herself for her future task at the foot of the altar. Her first miracle is said to have happened when she was only three years old, and is related in the following form in the Office of her feast in the Franciscan Breviary. Her aunt died after a short illness, her body was placed in a coffin, and the friends and relations of the deceased were weeping and lamenting beside the corpse, when the saintly child made her appearance in the room of death, and, falling on her knees, raised her little



hands to heaven while she prayed aloud. Then approaching the bed she called on her aunt by name, and to the utter amazement of the spectators the dead woman arose, completely and entirely restored to health and strength.

Space will not permit us to dwell upon the Saint's life of solitude and retirement spent under her parents' roof, on her ecstasies and penances, and the extraordinary and supernatural spiritual precocity evinced by the youthful virgin of Viterbo. It must be enough to make mention of the principal event which occurred during the seventeen years she spent on earth. She must have been about fourteen when, in obedience to our Lady, who appeared to her in a vision, she became a Tertiary of St. Francis. It was in this vision that Rose was commissioned to undertake work which may seem surprising in a child of her age, but which she is said to have performed with astonishing success, and which formed the distinctive feature of her life. At that time the heresy of the Patarines was rife in Viterbo, being fostered by the Emperor Frederick II., who had shortly before obtained possession of Viterbo and sought to use it as a weapon of attack in his campaign against the Holy Sec. The charge given to Rose was no less than to go forth and preach to these heretics and bring them back to the faith. We are told of how she proved the divinity of her mission by using arguments and giving answers quite beyond what she could have learnt by natural means. We are told, too, of signal miracles by which she confirmed her teaching. The fruits of her apostolate were consoling, but they drew on her a persecution, and she and her family were bidden by the Governor, under pain of forfeiting all their goods, to go forth from Viterbo in the middle of a severe winter. They took refuge first at Soriano and then at Vitorchiano, a village built upon a rock some eight miles distant from Viterbo.

Whilst at Soriano she is said to have predicted the impending death of Frederick II., and the end of his persecutions. There is, however, a difficulty about the dates. In any case, the following year she was enabled to return to her native city, where she immediately resumed her former life of solitude and prayer, which she continued till her early death.

In the eyes of Catholics, the chief interest of the quaint old city of Viterbo, with its frowning Lombard walls, its relics of antiquity, and its numerous fountains, is centred in that humble dwelling adjoining the garden of the Poor Clare Convent, where

the body of the holy maiden has rested during all these centuries. Since the year 1661, the only mode of access is through the convent enclosure, so it is essential for those who wish to approach the precincts that they should apply for a *permesso* at the Vatican. This being obtained, the heavy oaken doors of the stately convent are thrown hospitably open, and the daughters of St. Clare conduct their visitors through their spacious garden, where the grapes are ripening and rosy peaches cluster thickly on the trees, to the spot where stands the house of St. Rose's parents. Two rooms alone are now remaining. The smaller one, where the Saint first saw the light, and where she died, has been converted into a chapel, and here may be seen the window at which our Lady is said to have appeared when she bestowed the Tertiary habit of penance upon her favoured client. The dwelling-room of the family, with its raftered ceiling, wide open fireplace, and narrow staircase leading to a granary above, is adorned with various paintings representing the Saint's numerous miracles, and here are preserved the cannon-balls which are said to have been miraculously stopped by St. Rose's scapular, during the time when her native city was being besieged by the French. The incorrupt body of the Saint lies in a richly ornamental tomb, clad in that religious habit which she was not permitted to wear during her earthly existence. The precious possession is reverently guarded by the Poor Clares, an iron grating and a thick curtain concealing the sarcophagus from the view of those in the church which adjoins the convent. On the Saint's feast-day, and on one or two other occasions, the curtain is drawn back so that the body is visible through the railing, but the privilege of entering and kissing St. Rose's hand is one which can be only granted by the Holy Father. The present sombre hue of the skin of the face and hands is owing to the fact of the adjacent silken draperies having caught fire some two hundred years ago. The relics were miraculously preserved from destruction, being merely blackened by the flames.

The feast of St. Rose is celebrated on the 4th of September, the festivities, both religious and mundane, extending over four days. Visitors and pilgrims arrive in their hundreds in order to be present at it, and the usually grave old town assumes its gayest aspect. Religious *festas* all over Italy are as a rule distinguished by the same features, such as illuminations, processions, solemn functions in the churches, and an all-prevailing

atmosphere of harmless and innocent mirth. The feast of the Saint of Viterbo, however, is a thing apart, and possesses special characteristics quite its own.

The brief twilight is over and the shades of night are gathering over the ancient city. The Solemn Vespers of the eve, sung in the Church of Santa Rosa, are at an end, and the streets and piazzas are black with a dense crowd of people assembled together in eager expectation. Coloured lanterns gleam from all the windows, and draperies of vivid red hang suspended from every balcony, the silvery radiance of the autumnal moon lends a new beauty to the upturned faces of the dark-eyed southern women, and a murmur of many voices fills the soft night air. It is a motley crowd, composed of all sorts and conditions of men, the brightly-tinted gowns and sober-hued headgear of the Viterbese forming a striking contrast to the "fashion-plate" costumes of the visitors from Rome, Florence, and Milan. The brown habit of St. Francis can be seen side by side with the grey and crimson uniform of the Italian officer, and a little further on the black cassocks of Servite seminary students mingle with the black and white robes of St. Dominic. Presently above the hum of voices comes the sound of triumphal music, and the famous "Macchina" of St. Rose, a glittering structure towering high above the roofs of the houses and twinkling with innumerable lights, appears in the distance followed by a detachment of troops. A roar of applause mingles with the stirring strains of the band as this strange tower of living flame is borne along on the shoulders of sixty strong men, dressed in picturesque, old-world costumes of white and red. It is a scene to dwell in the memory for long years after, and whilst we witness it, the years seem to have rolled backwards and to have made us spectators of some pageant in mediæval Italy. The present, with its tyrannical Government and its down-trodden race groaning under their heavy load of taxes, fades away, and in its place the picture of the old grey city in its hours of glory rises from the long vanished past, recalling a period of less material civilization, of fewer scientific discoveries, but of greater liberty and fuller faith. The "Macchina" thus annually carried in procession through the streets of Viterbo on the eve of St. Rose, is seventeen metres high and four square, and is illuminated by two hundred and fifty tiny candles in glass globes and a hundred lamps lighted by electricity. The rose-crowned statue

of the Saint in her Tertiary habit crowns the summit, and the tower-like erection, which is made of carved wood, is further adorned by other statues of saints and angels, and by paintings representing some of the principal episodes in the Saint's history. A few hours before the procession the bearers are assembled together in the Church of Santa Rosa, to receive the blessing *in articulo mortis* in case of any accident occurring while the mighty "Macchina" rests upon their shoulders. In olden times when the tower was heavier, and the consequent danger considerably increased, it was compulsory on each man to prepare himself beforehand for any eventuality by the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist. Now-a-days, however, the performance of this pious practice is left to the private devotion of each. When the "Macchina" has wound its gleaming way through the narrow streets, with wonderful celerity it ascends the steep incline leading to the Church of Santa Rosa and the Poor Clare Convent, and is deposited in the piazza outside, where it remains on view throughout the following day. On the feast itself the Holy Sacrifice is offered up continually from early dawn until the noonday sun is high in the blue heavens. Pontifical High Mass is celebrated at half-past ten, and during the evening function the sweet voices of the nuns who guard St. Rose's body are heard in the choir. When night again throws her dark mantle over the "city of fountains," golden and rainbow-tinted rockets flash meteor-like up towards the starry skies, and amongst the "set-pieces," the "Macchina" forms the principal feature, surrounded by a glow of rosy radiance. The *fiesta* is further celebrated by horse-races and a "Tombola," and by the 6th the pilgrims and merry-makers have taken their departure, the streets and piazzas are deserted, and the great event of the year at Viterbo is a thing of the past.

G. C.

## *The Attitude of the Church towards Natural Science.*

---

IT is just one hundred years ago since Allesandro Volta, a native of Como in the north of Italy, produced for the first time an electric current by chemical means, an experiment which has had, and will yet have far-reaching results in a science which is most intimately bound up with the temporal welfare of mankind. The Italians are justly proud of their distinguished countryman, and in order to celebrate the centenary of this great discovery and to honour the memory of the discoverer, they have been holding an electrical exhibition in his native town. There were gathered together the apparatus and instruments used by Volta, his personal relics, and his manuscripts and writings, nearly all unhappily destroyed by a disastrous fire. Among these papers was one especially interesting to English electricians, that of March 20th, 1800, in which he announced his discovery of the electric pile to Sir Joseph Banks, then the President of the Royal Society. There was, however, another, which should appeal most particularly to us Catholics, and which may fittingly serve as an introduction to the present discussion as to the attitude of the Catholic Church towards natural science. In his testamentary declaration<sup>1</sup> Volta wrote as follow :

I have ever held and still hold the Catholic religion as the only true and infallible one, and I ever thank Almighty God that He has inspired me with such a faith, in which I am firmly resolved to live and die, in the lively hope of obtaining eternal life. I recognize the Catholic religion as a gift of God, and as a supernatural faith. At the same time I have left no human means unused to strengthen myself ever more in it, and to combat every doubt which might rise in me against it, inasmuch as I have carefully studied it in its fundamental principles, and by reading books both of an apologetic and of a hostile character, have closely investigated the grounds both for and against it, and by this I

<sup>1</sup> Published by the *Eco d'Italia* and reproduced in the *Tablet*.

have been still more firmly strengthened in the conviction that the Catholic religion is absolutely credible even to human reason, and that every right thinking mind ought to admit and love it.

These noble words, which do but re-echo the sentiments of every true child of the Catholic Church, are particularly valuable as the testimony of a distinguished expert in natural science. They may serve as an antidote to the falsehood which is being continually urged against the Church, that she is necessarily opposed to the progress of natural science, and exercises a baneful influence in opposition to its truths. "In addition to the truth of the doctrine of evolution, indeed, one of its greatest merits in my eyes, is the fact that it occupies a position of complete and irreconcilable antagonism to that vigorous and consistent enemy of the highest intellectual, moral, and social life of mankind, the Catholic Church."<sup>1</sup> So wrote the late Professor Huxley, as spokesman for the party, of those who come forward as the prophets of a creed which being thoroughly materialistic, is necessarily opposed to a supernatural organization such as is the Catholic Church. It is not their science that is at fault, but this foisting of the thoroughly immoral tenets of no God, no soul, no free-will upon their science. Their antipathy is only equalled by their intolerance, at least to judge from the following passage likewise extracted from the writings of Professor Huxley. "Ultramontanism is demonstrably the enemy of society; and must be met with resistance, merely passive if possible, but active if necessary, by 'the whole power of the State.'"<sup>2</sup> We must charitably suppose that men of the school of Huxley, Häckel, and Herbert Spenser are sincere in their adherence to the doctrines of materialism, and that their opposition to a Church which claims to be supernatural in its origin, its end, and in its means of attaining that end, arises from misdirected education, or inborn prejudice, and invincible ignorance. In their restricted view science is limited entirely to deduction from experiments and observations on matter either organic or inorganic which in some way comes under the cognisance of the senses. Agnosticism is the primary article of their creed, or the refusal to know anything that is not presented to the mind in this restricted manner, thereby connoting the virtual denial of the very first principles

<sup>1</sup> *Critiques and Addresses*, p. 271. London: Macmillan and Co., 1873.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* Preface, p. ix.

or axioms in reasoning innate in us all. The principle of a divinely appointed, authoritative teacher of truth, and such truth as cannot be acquired by experimental investigation, but is contained in a revealed deposit, is thoroughly antagonistic to such a creed or rather lack of creed. "If any one is able to make good the assertion that his theology rests upon valid evidence and sound reasoning, then it appears to me that such theology will take its place as a part of science," was another dictum of Professor Huxley's. Had he but studied the credentials of the Catholic Church in the spirit of Volta, with an unbiassed and an unprejudiced mind, he could not have failed to have arrived at the same conclusion as did the eminent electrician, "that the Catholic religion is absolutely credible even to human reason, and that every right-thinking mind ought to admit and love it." For the method by which the Church proves her divine origin, and her right to teach with authority, is rigidly scientific, and should she abandon this method in favour of a purely experimental and observational method of investigation of her claims, such as is demanded by her adversaries, she would indubitably lay herself open to the charge of acting in an illogical and irrational manner.

For the method of proof of any proposition ought to be adapted to the subject-matter of the proposition. It would be obviously contrary to right reason to endeavour to prove the Binomial Theorem by an appeal to the characteristics of an elephant, or to wish to show that Jupiter had five moons, by collecting shells on the sea-shore. And yet this is the kind of irrelevant proof that adversaries demand for her doctrines. Let us hear M. Rénan with regard to miracles.<sup>1</sup>

Let us suppose [he writes] that a wonder-worker should present himself to-morrow with credentials of sufficient value to be discussed; that he should announce, I suppose, his power of raising one from the dead. What ought to be done? A commission would be named composed of physiologists, physicians, chemists, and persons well versed in historical criticism. This commission would select a corpse, having assured themselves that death was real, they would choose the room in which the experiment should be performed, and would regulate all the precautions necessary to exclude every semblance of doubt. If under such circumstances, a resurrection should take place, the probability acquired would be almost equal to certitude. Nevertheless, since an experiment should be always capable of repetition, and since

<sup>1</sup> *Vie de Jésus*, Introduction, p. li.



what has once been done ought to be able to be done again, and since too in the order of miracles there cannot be question of the easy and difficult, the wonder-worker would be invited to repeat his marvellous feat under other circumstances, upon other corpses, and in other surroundings.

All that is necessary to add is, that if miracles could be thus performed to order, like the tricks of a conjurer, they would cease to be miracles. Nevertheless, the proof of the miracles admitted by the Church, for instance, in the canonization of her saints, is much more exact and rigid than even M. Rénan would have imagined.

It has been truly said that a man could conceivably develop from first principles of reasoning the most recondite truths in pure mathematics, even if he were shut up in a darksome dungeon for the term of his natural life. But he could not tell that if sealing-wax were rubbed on his coat it would attract scraps of paper, unless he had seen the experiment performed. Similarly, although it is quite true that by observing the natural phenomena of this world, their order, their relations of cause and effect, and their beauty, even the uncultivated mind of a savage must necessarily rise to the acknowledgment of the existence of a Supreme Being as Creator and Dispenser of all things, as the Book of Wisdom<sup>1</sup> tells us, yet this observational method of proof could not possibly tell us, except indirectly and remotely, that God had committed a body of revealed doctrine to a Church which should teach them with infallible authority to mankind. To expect that experiment or observation, or the measurements and weighings of the physical investigator should be able to prove such truths, as many materialistic philosophers seem to demand, is thoroughly illogical and unscientific. Truths such as these are supernatural, and hence, if capable of proof, necessarily demand a method which is above nature. And hence the right of infallible teaching in the realm of dogma claimed by the Church is attested by a stupendous miracle in the physical order, and one correspondingly magnificent in the moral order. Taking the word from St. Augustine, it is a marvellous thing that one truly a Man, though likewise God, should have raised Himself from the dead after lying in the tomb for a part of three days, and it is almost a greater marvel that twelve unlettered, uncultured, poor fishermen should have persuaded a world, sunk in all the degradation of pagan luxury,

<sup>1</sup> Wisdom xiii, 1—9.

to believe this truth and accept all its consequences of self-denial, and the carrying of the Cross. Here are two facts in the supernatural order, one of which is still palpable and living, crying out for recognition in every age of the world. How explain that in spite of persecution and proscription, heresy and schism, internal dissension and political intrigues, at times even a local lowering of the high standard of holiness, the Catholic Church is still the same to-day as she was when founded, nineteen hundred years ago, by Jesus Christ upon Peter the Rock, and the Centre of all unity. Of such a nature is the proof of the credibility of the Church, which though it does not produce faith, which is a gratuitous supernatural gift of God, yet precedes it. The assent which a reasoning and reasonable mind should give to these preambles of faith is a natural assent, such as we should give to a fact which exists in the natural order, scientific or historical. The assent of faith is of a higher order, supernatural on account of the infused virtue. It is quite true, as Volta has said, that if we examine the fundamental principles of the Church, we shall see that she is absolutely credible even to human reason. But the proving of the groundwork of faith is not faith. Though carefully discriminating the one from the other, yet we see that the process of proof is absolutely scientific in the truest sense of the word. There is nothing in the truths of faith which is contrary to reason, although there is much that is above and beyond reason.

As the origin of the Church was supernatural, as its indefectibility and permanence is supernatural, so too is its end supernatural. That end is the salvation of the souls of her children, that they may one day come to the possession of the Beatific Vision. With this end before her, is it to be wondered at that the Church is unbending and inflexible, not only in defending the essentials of the body of doctrines which she teaches, and the manner of good living which she commands, but also in warding off what might remotely tend, or even seem to tend, to the destruction of faith? This is the key to her seeming adverse attitude towards natural science. As Bishop Hedley has told us in a recent article on "Physical Science and Faith,"<sup>1</sup> the Church is not opposed to science. Her tradition is to the contrary. But she has opposed many scientific men who mingled up with perhaps real discoveries in science attacks on

<sup>1</sup> *Dublin Review*, October, 1898.

revealed religion. In spite of herself she has been forced into opposition. The Church must necessarily be suspicious of even the most acute of scientific men, if he show any tendency to contravert doctrine.

The case of Galileo, befriended and honoured as he was by Urban VIII. and all the Churchmen of his day, is a case in point. That one, however eminent in scientific discovery, should profess obedience to the Church, and yet follow in the wake of the Protestant Reformers, who claimed the right of free judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, would have been a scandal to the little ones of Christ's flock. Is it so wonderful that his conduct was condemned by the Roman Congregations. Whether they exceeded their powers in declaring the heliocentric theory itself to be contrary to Scripture, is a side-issue which may be safely left to the discussion of experts. But to represent the Church as condemning the illustrious Florentine because of her consistent opposition to science, is an ignorant libel. The heliocentric theory was no new scientific doctrine, for it had already been upheld as far back as the year 1435 by Cardinal Nicholas de Cusa, and perfected by the illustrious canon of Thorn, Copernicus. The chief proof which Galileo adduced in its support, that from the tides, was utterly fallacious and paradoxical, and was easily shown to be so by the experts who were advisers to the Congregation; as Cardinal Bellarmine wrote in a letter addressed to the Carmelite Foscarini, dated April 12, 1615, that it was not

the same thing, to show that by supposing the sun to be central and the earth in the heavens, all the appearances were explained, and to demonstrate that in reality the sun occupies the centre of the world, and that the earth moves in the skies.

And in the same letter, as evidence of the liberal-mindedness of this one at least of Galileo's judges,

If a true demonstration should be found that the sun is placed at the centre of the world, and the earth in the third heaven, and that the sun does not turn round the earth, but the latter round the former, then it will be necessary to proceed with great prudence in the explanation of Scripture, which seems to say the contrary, and rather to avow that we have not understood it, than to declare a demonstrated fact false.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*, vol. ii. p. 172, "La Condemnation de Galilée," Ph. Gilbert.

Galileo did not and could not furnish a convincing proof, and yet insisted on playing the theologian and exegetist. Is it to be wondered at that he was prevented from doing mischief by his inopportune assumption of functions that did not belong to him? If it be considered dispassionately, this one case of seeming opposition between the Church and science falls entirely to the ground. The mistake of the Congregation was one of fact, not one of principle.

This attitude of the Church in jealously guarding the deposit of faith committed to her care against the attacks of those scientific men who are opposed to her, is not only not adverse to true scientific progress, but aids and assists it in a remarkable degree. Even in the natural sciences themselves the conclusions of one are at times opposed to the conclusions of another, as for instance in the contradiction between the astronomical and biological sciences with regard to the age of the earth as an abode fitted for man. Such sciences interact one upon the other, and it is only by a sifting process, and by the elimination of what is false, that we ultimately arrive at an approach to the truth. Moreover, we must bear in mind when considering the relations of revealed doctrine and scientific truths, that the former cannot be increased, but can only be applied to, and illustrated by, new cases which may arise, or can be evolved, in the sense that the hidden meanings of the doctrines, and their beautiful harmony and uniformity can be the better fathomed and manifested by the studies of theologians. On the other hand, the sum-total of scientific truth is not a fixed quantity, but is ever being added to as men penetrate more deeply into the secrets of nature. Hence the hypotheses of science are ever being abandoned in favour of more far-reaching laws and wider generalizations. In the study of natural science we are comparatively speaking groping in the dark. But for those who believe, the light of faith illuminates their mind with truth which is infallible. As our Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., expressed the matter in his allocution to scientific men of the 7th of March, 1880:

The obedience which is rendered to Christian faith is in no way derogatory to the dignity of man's reason, but rather is much to its advantage: since the truth is both the better perceived and followed the more securely, when divine faith like a torch has shown the path to minds which are eager for knowledge.

Moreover, he points out that it is a widespread error to imagine that revealed truth cannot co-exist with the deductions of science. The source of this error is to be attributed to ignorance and neglect of the higher studies of philosophy and theology. The result is that many minds understand these truths only in a restricted and partial manner. Science and faith must of necessity be in agreement, for God is the author of both our reason and of our faith, and He has ordained that the one should be adapted to the other. The same truth is insisted on still more in the Encyclical Letter of June 20, 1888, on "Liberty." It shows that reason itself tells us that revealed truths and natural truths cannot be really opposed, and hence whatever in science is contradictory to revealed truth must be false. From this it follows that the Church, far from being adverse to the progress of science, furnishes it with much light and safe guidance. Moreover, we must bear in mind that there is an immense field open to the investigations of the scientific man, in which there is no restriction possible; in those matters, namely, which have no necessary connection with faith or morals, or in which the Church, without any exercise of her authority, leaves the judgment of the learned unhampered and free.

To apply these principles to one or two concrete examples. Hæckel and his followers would have us believe that the process of evolution is unbroken from the primeval inorganic atom of the original nebulous mass to the fully developed man with all his faculties, not of body alone, but also of soul. But the light of revealed truth which affirms as an article of divine faith that each individual soul of man was created immediately and directly by God Himself, shows us unmistakably that this doctrine of Hæckel, which is called "monism," is wrong, and that either the premisses from which he draws his deductions are untrustworthy, or that his reasoning from facts, rightly observed, is fallacious. There is not and cannot be any evolution of the soul from inorganic atoms, or of mind from matter. Or again in the realms of physical science the doctrine of the Conservation of Energy asserts that the total amount of energy in any material system is a constant quantity which cannot be added to or taken from, but can only suffer transformation into any of the forms of which energy is capable, as light, heat, mechanical energy, chemical energy, electrical energy, and the rest. This generalization of the laws of physical science has to be squared with the doctrine of free-will,

for energy is apparently created by its exercise. Otherwise, so say the objectors, we become merely automata. We do not affirm that the two doctrines are contradictory or exclude the one the other. Leibnitz, Descartes, Clerk-Maxwell, and more recently Père Couailhac<sup>1</sup> have endeavoured to show their compatibility. But we may safely assert that if the doctrine be opposed to the dogma of the existence of free-will, then it is false, and a more trustworthy physical hypothesis must be formulated.

Finally, to affirm that the Church is in any way opposed to the progress of natural science and loves the darkness of error and ignorance, is a calumny either malicious, or arising from a thorough misreading of the history of the Church and of learning. Had it not been for the numerous gratuitous parochial and monastic schools which existed before the dark days of the Reformation, learning and science would have utterly perished from the face of the civilized land. Science, as represented by astronomy and numbers, formed a part of the curriculum of every well-appointed school in the middle ages. We build magnificent board schools, we fit them up with well-appointed laboratories for the teaching of elementary science, and the children are taught to measure and to weigh. These things are excellent, and accord with the mind of the Church, which would advance culture in every possible way. But it is to be questioned whether the modern pupil of the elementary schools is as conversant with natural facts as was his predecessor of the middle ages. Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* were written for the people, and the allusions in them are presumably such as the common people could understand. The knowledge of simple astronomy of position displayed in this book, would do credit to, if indeed it would not be beyond, the capabilities of a brilliant pupil from the schools of this scientific age. If the Church is opposed to the progress of science, how explain the patronage consistently bestowed upon it by the Roman Pontiffs? Our present Holy Father, mindful of this tradition, has continually, during his long reign, inculcated the necessity of the study of natural science by students of every degree in the Catholic school, and more especially by those destined for the priesthood. Moreover, he has given a signal mark of his interest in science by restoring out of his restricted funds the observatory of the Vatican, and equipping it with the most modern instruments.

<sup>1</sup> *La liberté et la Conservation de l'énergie.* Paris : Lecoffre.



Again, if the Church is adverse to the progress of science, how explain that the first scientific society ever founded, that of the Lincei, was due to the initiative of Prince Frederico Cesi, a devoted child of the Church, was strenuously supported by the reigning Pontiff, Urban VIII., and was again restored at the beginning of this century by Leo XII. Or as we have already mentioned the name of Volta with honour, how account for the pre-eminence of so many devout Catholics in the study of the natural sciences? Volta was an electrician, and in this science alone the names of Galvani, Coulomb, Ampère, and Röntgen, whose brilliant discovery is the theme of universal praise, form a brilliant heading to the roll of honour. And as with electricity, so with the other sciences. In the teeth of such evidence, how is it possible that the Church should have been or should be called "the vigorous and consistent enemy of the highest intellectual life of mankind"?

The moral is obvious, that even in matters scientific it will conduce most to true progress if we follow obediently the teaching and guidance of the Church, and her voice as expressed and made known to us by her accredited agents. Roman Congregations may make mistakes; though one who carefully studies the history of science must be bound to admit that they have made exceedingly few, probably only one, and that solitary instance in a matter of fact which was not then proved. For there does exist a Providence which guides the rulers of the Church of Jesus Christ, while it is yet to be proved that scientific men as such receive special light and direction from the Holy Spirit. The attitude of one who is continually carping at the decisions of Congregations, Bishops, and recognized shepherds of the flock, in those matters of ecclesiastical economy which have some connection with science, is un-Catholic and disloyal. "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free,"<sup>1</sup> said our Lord to His disciples; words which our present Holy Father has, in his Encyclical on "Liberty," applied to the guidance which natural science receives from the truths of revealed religion. Truth and liberty is what is requisite for the progress of scientific discovery. It is to be obtained by obedience to the religion and doctrines revealed by Jesus Christ and committed as a precious deposit to the Church which is founded on the Rock.

A. C.

<sup>1</sup> St. John viii. 32.



## *A Charge of Slave-holding against Jesuit Missionaries.*

---

IT is more than a year since Mr. Lionel Decle's *Three Years in Savage Africa* was published. Its record of courageous enterprise, told in so interesting a style, would have sufficed, even without Mr. H. M. Stanley's commendatory introduction, to acquire for the work a lasting popularity, as a record of what is going on at present in South and East Africa. But all the more on that account does it become a serious matter, when this writer is found to bring a grave charge of self-seeking and cruelty against a body of missionaries who have settled down in a remote colony, professedly that they may devote their lives to the well-being of the natives. Such a charge, however, Mr. Decle brought against the Jesuit missionaries in the Portuguese territory on the Lower Zambesi, whom he accused of practising a "kind of legalized slavery" which "shrouds itself under the cloak of religion."

The passage naturally attracted the attention of those who are always on the look-out for anything they can utilize to excite prejudice against the Jesuits, and it is sure to do duty from time to time in ultra-Protestant publications. Accordingly it seemed desirable to open up communications with the Jesuits at Boroma, the Mission station in question, and hear what comments they had to make upon Mr. Decle's account of their doings. The greatness of the distance rendered it impossible to expect an answer whilst the interest in the matter was still topical, but even at this late date our Catholic readers may find it instructive to compare the accusation with the defence.

We will begin by quoting somewhat extensively from Mr. Decle's pages. The general subject of his eleventh chapter is the misgovernment of the Portuguese colony, and he represents the colonists there as oppressing and practically enslaving the natives. After other illustrations of their malpractices, he comes, on p. 247, to the passage relating to the Jesuits.

Another kind of legalized slavery which exists on a great scale here shrouds itself under the cloak of religion. Nowhere is slave-dealing carried on so openly and shamefully as by the Jesuits. They are perpetually buying young slaves for a couple of pieces of cotton "to save them from slavery." This seems to me a very curious way of discouraging the slave trade. They teach the children under their care a little religious history and a few elementary principles of education ; but their chief care is to put them to a trade, making them masons, carpenters, and the like. During the holidays, as they are ironically called, the children are made to work in the fields.

Whatever may be thought of buying the children, this mode of bringing them up does not appear so improper, but Mr. Declé continues :

All this would be very good work if it were disinterested. The fact is that when the children are grown up the Jesuits claim to keep them for their own purposes. For example, one of their carpenters went away to work on his own account. The Jesuits had him seized by the authorities and forced to work for them. While I was in the neighbourhood a child left their seminary for a week. On his arrival at home he complained of having been ill-treated, and his state of health confirmed what he said. His brother, although a black, had been educated at Lisbon and happened to be a man of some education—a notary ; and he decided not to send him back to the mission, but to keep him at home and send him to school at Tete. Immediately the authorities were bombarded with letters asking them to compel the child to return to the Mission. The Jesuits observed that constraint was indispensable in such cases ; that it was deplorable to give in to the caprices of the blacks, and that in the interests of civilization it ought not to be done.

Whether the brother's right of guardianship was infringed in this case we shall be better able to determine presently, but surely there was reason in the contention that, if the caprices of half-educated black brothers must be allowed to prevail, no solid work in training these native children was possible. Indeed, as we shall see lower down, Mr. Declé himself, under different circumstances, can recommend to the colonists in British domains the very things which he blames in the Jesuits, and a good deal more than he is able to bring home to them. However, in their case he does not think it "necessary to comment on this (practice) except to ask in what it differs from slavery," and he goes on to tell us that it is in fact a very cruel slavery.

A slave among the natives is generally well treated by his master, and it is remarkable that children carried off from their own tribe usually become so closely assimilated with their new tribe that in war

they are the fiercest enemies of their own people. I do not mean to hold up this state of things as an admirable one; but at any rate, the disposition of these slaves is in very striking contrast to that of the pupils of the Jesuits, whose one hope is to escape. The Protestant missions may have their faults, and plenty of them; but, at least, when they teach the natives a trade they also put them in a position to profit by it. The Jesuit Fathers, on the other hand, seem to think that they have returned to the good old Middle Ages with their serfs and vassals. On the religious side they are transported with horror to think of the superstition of the barbarous negroes, their ancestor worship, and their belief in evil spirits. This they replace by the belief in miracles and the devil.

Possibly the Fathers might urge that in making this difference between the two beliefs, they had the Bible to support them, and, although Mr. Decle omits to mention it, we may presume that their religious teaching is not confined to these two articles. However, it is their alleged slave-making that we are concerned with just now, and we may disregard the attack on their teaching.

Here, then, is Mr. Decle's accusation. Let us now hear what the Superior of the Jesuit Mission at Boroma has to say about it. Our quotations are from an interesting letter from this Superior, written last November, but which was not despatched till early in the present year, and only reached us a few weeks ago. The mission belongs to the Portuguese Province of the Society of Jesus, but this Superior, Father Hiller, is a German, and has worked in our English mission of Grahamstown. We give Father Hiller's account in his own words, except for a few slight verbal alterations where the English terms or idioms have been insufficiently caught.

Missao de Sao José de Boroma, Nov. 20th, 1898.

Reverend Father,—In due time I received the letter from Father Daignault requesting me to make some comments as to the truth of certain statements contained in a recently-published book by Mr. Lionel Decle, entitled *Three Years in Savage Africa*. The gist of the assertions in question is that our Society or Mission on the Portuguese Zambesi encourages slave trade and forced labour "under the cloak of religion."

Mr. Decle's book came into my hands a few days ago, and although the limited time at my disposal allowed of a cursory perusal only, I at once arrived at the conviction that the author lacks soundness of serious, unbiassed observation, such as is absolutely imperative for a work that aspires to stand the test of truth and time. This applies especially to the chapters containing the above-mentioned allegations, on the value of which, after my sixteen years' experience in these regions, I am perhaps qualified to form a competent opinion

Mr. Declé mixes up events in a most promiscuous manner; he gathers information without any discrimination, and has given credence to reports of the strangest kind. It is thus that perhaps unwittingly he has reached conclusions which are in flagrant opposition to the facts, and may do great harm.

He is evidently possessed by a strong desire to laud the system of English colonization. That system is of course excellent—but, at the same time, the writer should seek to do justice to the endeavours of other nations also and not dwell only on their deficiencies.

He has travelled through English, Portuguese, German, and French colonies. No doubt he found defects everywhere, but why abuse so much the Portuguese authorities, who, after all, do as much as they can towards a proper administration of their possessions? Portugal is a small country, with limited means. She cannot be expected to get the same results as Great Britain, with her immense resources.

One thing is certain, namely, that slavery is strictly prohibited by the laws of our colony, and that offenders are severely brought to book whenever possible. The negroes in and round Tete or other centres are fully aware of this fact, and no slaves are to be met with in such places excepting those who chose for themselves what is called "voluntary" slavery. The term is paradoxical no doubt, but it means that a negro sometimes offers to work in return for his food and clothing—to work as he himself calls it, as *muana ua muzungu X.*, &c., *i.e.*, as "child of the white man X.," &c.

But unfortunately in the remote districts of the Portuguese possessions, where it is impossible to exercise full control over the dealings of malefactors, owing to the almost insuperable difficulties of communication, the slave trade is still carried on. But who is bold enough to assert that the same thing does not occur in the dominions of other nations? In any case it is not the place of the missionary to take the sword in hand and open a crusade against the offenders. Their weapons must be those of peace.

Passing from these useful general observations, Father Hiller comes to the formal charge made against his own mission.

Mr. Declé says that we are perpetually buying young slaves in "order to keep them for our own purposes." I have said that slave-trading is still carried on in the far distant corners of the colony, and that at present no one can check it. What, then, if we hear from time to time of an unfortunate child that has been stolen from its parents? Can we fail to pity the lot which awaits this poor innocent, the dreadful life of a forced slave, there in the interior, where no ray of humanity and civilization has as yet penetrated. And if so, and we have it in our power to rescue that child by means of a payment—for force we cannot use—should we not make such payment—we, who came here to devote our lives for the sake of the poor, miserable black men. Can we stand

by and see the little victim carried off into slavery? And yet if we do Mr. Decle brands us at once with the baleful name of slave-dealers.

So much about the buying, from which we see that Mr. Decle left out a material fact—namely, that the children are not so much bought as bought back, or rescued at a cost from the hands of cruel masters. Now about the way in which these rescued children are treated by the Fathers.

It must not be imagined that we content ourselves with merely liberating a child. In accordance with the regulations of our Mission, we assume and have to assume the place of guardians to it. We undertake to watch over its worldly and spiritual welfare. The child is fed, clothed at our own expense. We teach him the elementary principles of education, and instil into his mind and heart the first lessons of the Christian religion. As he grows up he is taught some trade, remaining with us until he reaches the age of eighteen years, which is the date of the recognized majority in our colony. After that time *he is at liberty to go where he chooses*; we have done our duty by him. These are the real facts, and in view of them I trust Mr. Decle will acknowledge the hollowness of his charge that we use the children brought up by us *for our own purposes*.

And this retractation Mr. Decle ought all the more to make, as it appears that he not only saw no cases in which the Jesuits, "when the children were grown up, claimed to keep them for their own purposes," but, considering the date of his visit to Boroma, could not possibly have seen any such cases.

As a matter of fact, when this gentleman paid us his visit, the system had only been in work four years, and not one of our pupils had finished his education. Yet this circumstance did not deter Mr. Decle from jumping to absolutely wrong and injurious conclusions.

Father Hiller next comes to the alleged facts which Mr. Decle adduces as illustrations of what he asserts.

As a kind of corroboration of his allegations Mr. Decle mentions that a child, a young carpenter, and a shepherd, who had run away, were brought back to us by force. As to the shepherd's story, it is an invention of Mr. Decle's, for our shepherds are not schoolboys, but adults whom we engage from the villages. As to the others, in view of what has been said already, nothing really need be added, but these few words may be useful. As I have said, we undertake to watch over our pupils and care for them to the best of our abilities. Now if, given the easily-influenced mind of a negro, one or other of them takes it into his head to run away at the age of eight, ten, twelve years, are we not allowed to bring him back? Are we, as his guardians and foster-parents, not bound to

do so? What would any community in England think of parents or guardians or the authorities of any orphanage if they allowed any of their children or pupils to leave home without permission, and if they never inquired what became of them or did not try to have them brought back?

There is no reason, however, why the Fathers should not also claim the return of a runaway pupil during his minority on the ground that he is depriving them of the labour to which they had a just right. They might have claimed these contractual rights even had they been considering only their personal advantage. But they could claim them also in the name of charity, as it was for the sake of the natives, not for their own sake, they were keeping the Mission going. Hence Father Hiller adds,

Another point. Irrespective of our moral obligation not to allow the child to become a vagabond, we are in fairness entitled to certain compensation for our labour, food, and clothing bestowed on him. It is his duty to help us as far as he is capable till he reaches the above-stated age of majority.

This is *his* part of the compact, which resembles the fulfilment of the duties of a child towards his parents. And even that is for his own good. *Work* in conjunction with *religion* helps to make him into a useful member of the community. They keep him away from laziness and vice, and on them rest the whole progress and success of our endeavours among the ignorant heathen. And even Mr. Decle seems to admit not only the necessity of work to civilize the black race, but even of *forced labour*. For we can read in his *Mashonaland*:<sup>1</sup> "To civilize them, to raise their moral standard, can only be done by *compelling* them to work, and although this at first appear unfair to them, it is, after all, only what exists in every civilized country, where the man who remains idle is punished as a rogue and a vagabond. This principle is the keynote of Mr. Rhodes' whole native policy."

Father Hiller stops his quotation from Mr. Decle here, but it continues thus:

Some sensitive philanthropists, with more heart than head, have been pained at the thought of the white man teaching the black man to want things he had never wanted before, and then making a profit out of the labour by which alone the black man can satisfy these new wants. The civilized man and the savage man may be equal in that each can satisfy in equal measure the wants he feels; but surely the highest and completest type of man is he who wants most, and from his wants derives the most satisfaction.

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 208.



Surely it must have been a temporary lapse of humour which allowed Mr. Decle to leave this passage standing in his account of Rhodesia, after he had written so inconsistently with it in his account of Boroma.

But what about the holidays which, according to Mr. Decle, it is an irony to call by that name?

Let no one imagine that our children have to work harder or longer than is compatible with the good state of their health and general welfare. They have their hours for play and their holidays. And I think it would be difficult to find a troop of boys and girls more cheerful and happy than ours at the Boroma Mission. This is the impression of all visitors.

It pleases Mr. Decle to call it an irony for our children to speak of holidays, the children having to work in the fields while they last. This is another allegation in flagrant conflict with the truth.

Twice during the year school is suspended, for the long vacation and the short one.

The former proves a very great treat indeed, both for big and little children, for at that time we all sally forth into the immense mango-forests on the left bank of the Zambesi, which are at a distance of four hours from the mission. There they stay for six to ten days, romping and running about in the cool groves of the wood, enjoying the fresh air and eating mangos, that tastiest of fruits, all day long. The older pupils are even given guns and powder that they may go and kill some game—so sport is not missing either. Can any one find fault with holidays of this description? During the short vacation instruction and work go on till about 10 a.m. The rest of the day is devoted to play and enjoyment. Besides every Thursday from 9 a.m. the boys are free, and every month at least they have once or twice a picnic, on which days the bigger boys pass most of their time in hunting.

If their children were always wanting to escape from a home of this kind, it ought surely be set down, not to the selfish inconsiderateness of the Fathers, but to the unsettled character which centuries of heredity have bequeathed to the negro. It turns out, however, that they do not show this desire to escape, but rather the opposite.

The boys' "one hope is to escape," says Mr. Decle. I would ask him why then our boys, when their education is finished, choose to settle down in the vicinity of the Mission stations? Why are our Christians the most persevering in their work? Because by the trade they learned when at school they are put in a position to profit by it, and earn by it a decent living, as any impartial visitor may see with his own eyes.

In summing up, Father Hiller explains the system on which they receive under their charge native children other than



orphans or rescued. It is a system which most people will consider just and reasonable.

I have now dealt with Mr. Decle's assertions. For general information I may add that very often children are brought to us by their parents for the purpose of being educated.

As in the case of orphans and rescued children we undertake to feed, clothe, and instruct the child *free of charge*. On the other hand the father guarantees that the boy shall remain with us till the age of eighteen. He, however, has the option of taking him away from us before the expiration of that period if he pays the arrears for his keep and clothing for the time when he was with us. A third class of pupils is composed of young men mostly, who have means enough to pay a monthly fee, for which they are provided with all necessaries of life. They of course can enter and leave whenever they choose to do so.

Such is the true account of the facts which Mr. Decle has so cruelly misrepresented. We claim it as the true account, for it bears the marks of truth on its face, which the account of Mr. Decle does not. The Fathers, too, of the Boroma Mission feel able to appeal with confidence to the testimony of many English friends and of visitors who have been their guests.

Such is the character of the Boroma school. I am sure that the numerous English gentlemen who did us the honour of visiting us and often stayed for days with us, being able to see and know all about the place, will feel disgusted if they happen to read the unjust representations of Mr. Decle's book on the Boroma Mission. I think the English gentlemen settled at Tete, such as Major Robertson, the Directors of English Companies, and visitors like Major Gibbons and his staff, and others of B. C. A. would write quite differently on the Boroma Mission. But often it is enough to be a Jesuit to see one's work blackmailed in the most ungentlemanly ways.

Father Hiller's concluding paragraph runs as follows :

No more remains to be said. It distresses us, however, to find that Mr. Decle, who enjoyed our hospitality here for a number of days, and was supplied by us with information, porters, photograph plaques, Caffre curios (which, by the way, he promised to pay for as soon as he arrived at Tete, and for which he has never yet paid a farthing), can reward us by publishing false and unfounded statements. This is adding insult to injury—the worst form of ingratitude.

Were there any foundation in his allegations we would bear them, though we might have bestowed favours on the person who uttered them, for above all let us maintain truth, in keeping with the well-known phrase,

Amicus Plato, Amicus Socrates,  
Sed magis amica veritas !

S. F. S.

## *Otherwhere.*

---

### CHAPTER XVI.

SESSOS, Klemenké, and their attendants passed through the cavern one afternoon, a few days after their arrangements had been made for the journey. They embarked at the Duke's private landing near the castle. This could only be used at high water ; on the present occasion it occurred at a little after sunset. The sea was smooth. The weather had been oppressively hot, but with evening came a gentle breeze from the west which made the air cool.

Klemenké, Sessos, and his servant Renos were the only members of the party who had ever before passed beyond the barrier-hills. The delight of the maids of honour and the attendants was extreme. Trained as they and their predecessors had been to regard passing into the world of the West as a thing which was for them beyond the limits of possibility, they were filled with an enthusiastic pleasure which it is not easy for us to realize.

For the greater part of the voyage there is deep water near the shore, so that the yacht was very rarely out of sight of land, and they were sometimes so near it as to be able to enjoy the beautiful scenes of rock, forest, and mountain which the coast presents. Night soon closed around them ; night with its thousand stars reflected in the mirror of the ocean. It was very late ere any of them sought their cabins, and all rose early, for Sessos had told wonderful stories of the medusæ which abound in those waters, all of which would disappear when the sun became powerful. Nearly every one was up to see the sun rise. About mid-day they came in sight of the Red Rock, as it is called, a promontory of great height jutting out into the ocean. It forms the end of a line of hills running east and west at right angles to the great mountain chain. It was noteworthy on several accounts. Politically it had great

significance as marking the northern limit of the ducal territory. At the bottom of the hill slope there was a little brook which formed the division between the two states. To the geologist the section of rock here exposed was of striking interest. From top to bottom it was composed of red sandstone, in which occurred at almost regular intervals beds of gypsum, giving it a striped appearance, much as if it were some gigantic feat of human handiwork. It was, in the breeding season, the haunt of myriads of sea birds, which built there almost entirely without molestation, for the Duke was interested in this great colony, and keepers were ever on the spot to guard the birds from the so-called sportsmen of Kara and the ill-disposed folk of his own dominions. The bed of the sea here sank so rapidly that the yacht could sail almost within the shadow of the precipice. There was a village to the north, just across the stream. Here it was the custom to take on board a pilot, for vessels going to Kara had to thread their way through an archipelago of islands, some mere verdure-mantled rocks, others forming gardens of many acres, where fruits and vegetables were grown to supply the markets of the city.

Many have spoken of the view of Kara from the bay as the most beautiful sight the world has to show: marble temples and palaces extending for miles along the shore of that ever-gentle sea. Beyond these the towers and domes of the great public buildings, and then further still, clinging to the hill slope, houses of every tint and form, which distance deprived of the squalor and misery that a nearer view revealed. Further away still, engirdling the city and reaching down to the waters on the north and south, were the parks and public gardens which shaded off into the forests that climbed the hills, outliers of those mountains which separated Kara from the dreary forest-lands where the slave-hunters were wont to find their prey. Here the mountains were of lower elevation than we have seen them further to the south; but some of them rose beyond the limit of perpetual snow, so that sometimes, as on the present evening, the glorious picture was framed by a row of glittering peaks.

It was seven o'clock when the vessel reached the stairs of the palace gardens. The Princess Fyné was there to meet her guests, surrounded by her Norendos guards.

"I was sure," she said, "that after your voyage you would like to dine quietly with me to-night. Your first interview

with the Emperor may well be put off till to-morrow. I am sure, Sessos, you have told the Princess that you and I are such old friends that we may dispense, for one day at least, with court ceremonial.

The dinner was served in a moderately sized, but very splendid room. No one had been asked to meet them, except the four ladies in attendance on the Princess, two of whom Sessos had often met before—none, that is, except Eklis, whose services the Princess thought might be useful in entertaining ladies from a country so utterly unfamiliar to her as Avenka. She was very agreeably surprised to find that her presence did not inspire in these women from an unknown land any of that awe which she had been accustomed to find exhibited by some of the greatest of the feudatory ladies who from time to time came to do homage to the Court of Kara. Their conversation was respectful, but as free and unrestrained as if they had known her all their lives.

When the evening was pretty far advanced, Fyné said, "You really must tell me, Princess, all that it is prudent for you to communicate about your country. Imagine how very anxious I must be to hear all about a civilized community which has existed for ages where these men of science have assured us there was nothing but ice—Eklis has been as bad, or rather worse, than the rest."

"Pardon me, your Imperial Highness. I have been silent, but I have never denied the existence of Avenka. I have known the place well for many years."

The Princess's countenance, far more than her words, showed that she thought the philosopher had offered but a lame excuse.

"I will pardon him, Princess," Fyné said, laughing. "He has now made ample amends by telling me the very wildest stories about Avenka. If I believed half of what he says, I should think Avenka far more lovely and three times as powerful as the place where you now are."

"I am very proud of my own dear home," Klemenké said, "but it is so unlike the little I have seen of Kara that I do not see how it is possible to compare one with the other—to draw a parallel between the military power of Kara and Avenka is preposterous—we have never fought for ages, except the barbarians far, far away on the east."

And I trust you never may, at least with us," Fyné rejoined. "Sessos, I am sure, knows, and I trust you will, now

that we have met, that I am delighted to see you for your own sake, but I cannot disguise from myself that on the present occasion yours is a political mission—we must be prepared for to-morrow. Will you accompany me into my cabinet? You, Eklis, may remain behind and amuse the ladies. With four natives of the land listening to you, you will not dare to tell my Norendos friends quite so much rubbish as you have favoured me with about the wonders of this newly-discovered world."

They followed the Princess into the apartment wherein we met her and Eklis on a former occasion.

"I am so glad, so very glad to see you, Princess. I do trust by our joint efforts we may be able to avert war, with all its horrors. Do tell me, is there no hope of inducing Lady Alé to consent to marry the Duke of Stuttnos? It is really a very far greater match than she had a right to aspire to—there is hardly a lady about the Court who would not be in love with him at five minutes' notice," said Fyné.

"There is no hope whatever," Klemenké replied.

"Cannot the foolish girl be made to see how evil her conduct is, and that she is bound to sacrifice herself, if it be a sacrifice, for the welfare of the State. We all have to do so in one way or another. I would far rather be among my own good and innocent Norendos people than in this wicked place, where I am thought to rule, but where when the Emperor gets a fancy into his head, I am far less powerful than any witch-woman, soothsayer, or dream-interpreter who at the moment happens to be in the ascendant. I know Alé is a friend of yours—can you influence her?"

"I will deliver any message with which your Imperial Highness may entrust me, but I am sure Alé will never consent to marry the Duke of Stuttnos," Klemenké said.

"Then cannot the Duke be persuaded or terrified into sending her here?" asked Fyné. "I would on no account use force were it in my hands, but the Emperor is imperative."

"He could not, if he would. I am sure the Duke does not know where she is," interposed Sessos.

"Then there is no help for it; we must really send an army to help him to look for her," said Fyné, smiling.

"I do not think they will be successful if they go. I am sure I should not be able to discover her, if she had any wish to hide herself from me," continued Sessos.

"Of course I know very well that you and the Princess aided her to escape. It was very wrong of you as the brother of our ally. I say nothing about the Princess—I do not think the Emperor has found it out. He still half believes the absurd fancy that the lady who came through the hill was not a woman at all, but a spirit, as those savages have told him," said Fyné.

"Will not his Majesty believe when he sees me that I am a real living woman?" inquired Klemenké.

"Yes, of course he will; but some way or other—you must not expect me to explain how—he disconnects you, I am sure, from the spirit which those savages talk of. All real rule here has to be administered by me. It is a terrible burden under such adverse circumstances. I could get on well enough if he would leave matters alone and simply amuse himself with the follies that interest him; but this he will not do; from time to time he is bent, out of childish vanity, on showing his power, generally in the most absurd fashion, and there is a gang of scoundrels about him who flatter his most childish whims—I am as well aware as you are, that the Queen of Avenka is shielding the refractory Alé. She is really very wrong in doing this; still, however provoking she may be, the strongest desire of my heart is to hinder war from breaking out. Can nothing be done to induce your Queen to surrender this silly girl? It would be so greatly to the advantage of Avenka, Kara, and the whole world. If war once begins, no one can tell to what far-off regions it may spread; besides, if she does not, I feel sure the Emperor will make a claim on her to render homage to him as her feudal lord."

Fyné observed that Klemenké's cheeks flushed. She had, however, that perfect command over herself possessed by the higher natures. The indignation she felt was repressed, as it must have seemed without effort, and she replied:

"I asked my sister what answer I was to return if this question were put to me, and she said, 'An unconditional refusal'—reminding me at the same time that unless a marriage were a free contract on both sides, it was not a marriage at all."

"She was—no doubt quite naturally—speaking from the Christian point of view. We have no such rule, and Alé is a worshipper of the gods of Kara. I am more sorry than you can understand, who do not know me, that we cannot settle

these things before you are received by the Emperor. Avenka is, as I now well understand, a powerful State. You and the ladies who are your companions are sufficient evidence of its high and beautiful civilization. It will break my heart if I have to be a party to destroying what must be in some respects unequalled," said Fyné, with real feeling in her voice.

"Comparisons between things so different are impossible. From what Sessos and Eklis have told me, and the little I have seen already, I imagine that Kara is the most beautiful place in the world. We have no gentle, island-studded sea at our doors, and the long range of marble temples, even from the glimpse I had of them, are, I am sure, supremely lovely," said Klemenké.

"Yes," added Fyné, contemptuously, "but devoted to silly and often revolting superstitions; but their magnificence is, I believe, unequalled, and the wealth of precious objects they contain incalculable. The misery of it is, that I, who have passed so very far beyond these things, have, for the sake of keeping the people in good-humour, to pretend no end of devotion to these dream-creatures. I do not at present know what the Emperor's plans may be as to your reception. It will not be very early, we may be sure. We shall meet at breakfast, and I will spend all the day he does not steal from us, in showing you the interesting things we have around us."

The reception was a magnificent, though somewhat barbaric affair. Such of the nobles and their wives, who could be gathered together on so short a notice, were present; there, too were the priests and priestesses of the various idol-temples, in their rich official dresses, all the foreign ambassadors, and, to cast some rays of intelligence over the affair, there were the leading professors from the University, representatives of the learned societies, and a few poets, novelists, and historians of distinction.

The Emperor's curiosity was not unnaturally excited by the prospect of receiving Klemenké. He was far too selfish to find it pleasant to entertain the guests who from time to time it was necessary for him to receive, but when he could induce Fyné to take all the care and responsibility off his hands, it was delightful to him to see fresh faces, and sun himself in the rays of the new forms of flattery which each fresh party of guests brought with them. Notwithstanding the information he had



received from Eklis, who had now no reason for reticence, he still clung to the opinion that these newly-revealed people must be but little short of barbarians, and that, whatever their state of civilization might be, they were assuredly subjects of his Empire. Living as he did, solely for his own gratification, with no regard for Kara even, except so far as the great Empire reflected lustre upon himself, he still had a great regard for his cousin Fyné. Her surpassing beauty and grace of manner had a permanent influence upon him which never could be displaced, even by the most abject of flatterers, for more than a few days. There is nothing so lasting as the power which the higher order of beauty gives, when it is united with intellectual radiance and a conscientiousness on which it is always safe to lean, and Fyné, notwithstanding great faults of character and some dark crimes, had a tender conscience. She loved her country and was sincerely anxious to do what was, in her opinion, for the best under most complex and harrowing conditions. Had she been trained under another aspect she might have been a heroine, for notwithstanding the materialistic atheism of which she made profession and whose dark negations she was bent on impressing on all around her, she was naturally a religious soul. Except when some fancy crossed his brain which promised new forms of self-indulgence, the Emperor was always willing to let the cares of rule devolve on his active and energetic cousin.

He had promised himself that he should derive much pleasure from the visit of Sessos, and his curiosity to see Klemenké was stimulated by what he had heard from Eklis. At dinner he watched her attentively and became more and more surprised, as the minutes fled by, that the barbarous land from which she came should have produced a being at once so refined and so completely self-possessed. As there were many persons present he could not make the inquiries which were upon his lips, for selfish as he was, the graces of society were familiar to him by habitual practice. If he were to receive the gratification he hoped for from Fyné's guests, he knew that he must be genial and self-restrained, hiding that fussy self-importance which was natural to him when he obeyed the dictates of his selfish character.

Several days passed away in enjoyment. Klemenké, as had been the fate of nearly every one who came within the range of Fyné's influence, became much attached to her; they were both

of far too powerful intellect to hope to influence each other permanently by those shallow artifices which women of the world so constantly use when dealing with those of their own sex—tricks which, like the pretended broken wing of the mother-partridge, when discovered, expose the very things which those who employ them are most anxious to conceal from view. Fyné had been but a very short time in the company of her guest ere she came to the conclusion that perfect openness was the only way by which she could succeed in influencing her, not only favourably towards herself, but what was of very far greater importance at the present time, towards those institutions of which she was the intellectual head, and over the evolution of which she watched with ever-patient care.

They visited the temples, the University, the museums, the picture-galleries, everything indeed which made Kara famous, except the great amphitheatre, one of the most magnificent sights of all. To that place Fyné shrunk from conducting them. She knew full well that they were Christians, and therefore felt that a place, red with the blood of martyrs for their faith, must necessarily be revolting to them. They never went out unaccompanied by an efficient guard.

Fyné told Klemenké that she and her companions might wander in the gardens at pleasure, but that it was never safe for even Sessos to go beyond their precincts unattended. "Manners are not now quite what they were in his student days," she said; "besides now he is a royal guest, which makes a world of difference. You will think this strange," she continued, "for I am told that in your own home even the Queen may venture out without a guard."

"We never take guards except on a few state occasions," Klemenké said.

"Avenka is not, I think, so vast a place as this; besides, your civilization is not founded on slavery—ours is. I think it by far the safer social system, but like everything else it has its attendant disadvantages," said Fyné.

"We all believe," Klemenké said, "that slavery is contrary to the first principles of justice."

"Justice," Fyné replied, with sarcasm in her voice, "is like all those other terms invented to denote abstract qualities, a mere name which corresponds to nothing outside ourselves. We are all the slaves of our own nature and the forces which surround us. You will pleasant things, so we call you good.

Others will what is unpleasant and they are called bad ; but these are mere terms, having relation to nothing in nature."

"But," said Klemenké, "is not the faculty which makes us long for justice for ourselves and others, a sister to that art faculty which makes us all love beautiful things—the one is of far less importance than the other, but both have the same origin in the nature of God."

"They are, it is true, sisters, twin-sisters ; but from my point of view, the art faculty is by far the more important, but both are the results of long ages of mental training," replied Fyné.

"And yet," said Klemenké, who was much interested by her friend's mental condition, "and yet there are the germs of the idea of justice in the most abject races, and we find the art faculty amongst the greatest savages, sometimes in great perfection. Those wild creatures, the head man amongst whom nearly killed me, can with the rudest tools make gold ornaments which no artisan in Kara or Avenka can equal."

"Yes, I have seen some of them," said Fyné, perhaps not unwilling to change the current of conversation. "How is it that the Duke did not put the man to death? A more deliberate attempt at murder I never heard of."

"The poor creature meant no harm. He thinks me an evil spirit, bent on injuring the Duke, whom he loves," said Klemenké.

"And do you approve of the Duke's imbecile weakness?" asked Fyné, with real interest.

"Yes," said Klemenké, "I should have been very sorry if the poor creature had suffered for what he meant as an act of kindness."

"You certainly carry out the precepts of your superstition ; if, however, such exhibitions of affection became common, the world would be a more dangerous place to live in than we find it even now. But I must leave you now to attend a council and try to keep the Emperor from giving pledges to the war party. We shall meet at luncheon. May I tell the Emperor that you will go this evening to see the performance of his new play at his private theatre? I hope you will. It will flatter him, and it is above all things necessary in the present state of affairs that no means should be left untried of interesting him favourably in you."

"Certainly," said Klemenké, "I am sure we can find something in it to admire."

"So imposture is one of the Christian virtues," said Fyné, smiling, as she left the room.

## CHAPTER XVII.

KLEMENKÉ and her companions strolled into the gardens in the direction of the sea. She was never weary of gazing down into the purple waters, watching the new and strange forms of life which every moment presented themselves for her admiration. The trees overhung the water, forming a delightful shade from the powerful rays of the sun. At length, after wandering about for a long time, she sat down on a bench to say her Rosary, while her friends continued their walk further along the marble terrace.

They had not been gone very long, when she became aware of gentle footsteps slowly approaching; she was, however, so intent on her religious meditation that she did not lift up her head, or even turn her eyes in the direction from which the sounds came. She imagined that it was one of her friends coming back to seat herself by her side. She was aroused to full consciousness by being addressed.

"Princess, are you not a Christian?" said a tall and very beautiful woman who paused beside her.

"Yes, oh yes," she answered.

"Then will you, for the love of God, pray for me? I am doomed to be thrown to the wild beasts as soon as you are gone away, because I will not worship the false gods of Kara. The Princess Fyné will not give the order while you are here, because she knows it will distress you so. As soon as you are gone I must die. Do pray for me. I am so very much afraid that my strength may fail me when the trial comes."

Klemenké shuddered. She thought that she had never seen any human being whose aspect showed more calm determination.

"Sit by my side, darling," she said, "and tell me all about it," making room for her on the seat.

"No, I must not do that. If I was seen even speaking to you, I should be scourged again," she said.

"Is there no means of saving you? I would do anything, everything, so would my sister, my husband—every soul in Avenka," Klemenké exclaimed.

"No, lady, there is no hope—none. Eklis, the philosopher, has offered the Princess anything, but she dare not spare me. Poor thing, how I pity her—compelled to commit these murders. Good-bye, lady. I know you will not forget me—good-bye,

until we meet in Heaven," the poor creature said, as she turned away.

"Stay, stay one moment, one little moment! What is your name?" Klemenké cried.

"Britna," the slave replied; "but here I am known as 31. It is worked on my left sleeve."

Klemenké grasped her hand, and pressed it reverently to her lips. She did not weep, but walked calmly back to her apartments, where she found her husband busily engaged in dictating his diary to his secretary Renos.

"Sessos," she said, "will you permit me to be so very uncourteous as to take Renos from you for a short time. I urgently desire to see Eklis. I want him to carry a letter for me."

Of course her husband consented. She sat down and wrote a few words in her native tongue to the philosopher. Renos knew where the apartments of Eklis were situated. He learned on reaching them, that the sage was in attendance on the Emperor. After waiting more than an hour, he was fortunate enough to gain an interview. Klemenké had not told Eklis in her note what she required, but the business was evidently of an important nature, which did not admit of delay. There was not, however, time to see her before luncheon, so he wrote a note saying that they would meet at Fyné's table almost at once, and that he would secure a private interview with her. They met in a very short time, and so well did Klemenké act the part she had undertaken, that even her husband was unaware that anything of an exciting nature had happened.

"I have had a long interview with the Emperor," Fyné said, "and he is as pleased as a little child with a new plaything, with the idea of your witnessing his drama this evening. Pray make ready all your power of admiration."

"There are really, your Imperial Highness, some passages of considerable merit, which I think the Princess cannot fail to be touched by," interposed Eklis.

"I do not doubt it for a moment," Fyné said, "and am prepared to be enraptured as I have been before; but then I know very well that either you or the jeweller poet, whom he has recently taken to patronize, have written them for him."

"The greatest of poets have had help from inferior hands. Why should not the greatest of Emperors, when he condescends to patronize poetry in his own person, employ underlings," said Eklis.

"You are to him in the world of imagination, what I am in the art of government. I hope he does not as recklessly resist your good advice as he does mine," Fyné replied.

"Sometimes," he said, with a smile; "but then, though, as your Imperial Highness has so often reminded me, politics are but for a day, while art is eternal; yet it must be conceded that politics are for the moment far more important than verse-spinning, and this conversation brings to my mind, your Royal Highness," he said, addressing Klemenké, "I promised to send despatches to her Majesty of Avenka to-day. Can you find time to give me your instructions?"

"I have really very little to say, except what you have yourself heard from the Princess Fyné herself. It may perhaps, however, give a more business-like impression if we walk together alone for five minutes in the gardens, and I am seen from the windows issuing my orders to you with extreme gravity. I hope, Princess, you will not fail to observe how very well I can assume the character of ambassador," said Klemenké, rising.

"A post which I hear has in all seriousness been conferred on the Duchess, who is now at Naverac. I am too anxious that these clouds should disperse to let the official world here share in my private information," Fyné said.

"She went to announce our marriage to the King," Klemenké replied.

"And you are quite sure, of course, that she will never mention the strained relations with Kara, or the silly conduct of the Lady Alé. You possess, dear Princess, one faculty very essential to the post you have assumed—you can keep a secret. I wish all my agents were like you," she said, archly, as Klemenké left the room.

They walked for a short distance across the turf. Klemenké soon seated herself on one of the pretty benches near the fountain. Eklis stood beside her. She did not make a sign for him to be seated. She knew well that there are times when it is necessary that official persons should maintain that dignified solitude and reserve, which often sit so ungracefully on those who have been born in regal positions without inheriting kinglike qualities.

"Have you really anything you wish to say to me? We cannot possibly be overheard here. I will take your business first," she said.

"Nothing whatever, madam, except that I must say you have found the Princess Fyné urgently desirous of peace, but that she is fearful of war, and that she asked your Royal Highness if the Queen would give up the Lady Alé, and that you made the only possible reply. I must also let the Queen know that the part of the army in garrison in and around Kara, is being put on a war footing," interposed Eklis.

"My reason for summoning you so hastily," Klemenké said, "is to tell you that I have seen the Christian slave Britna, No. 31. She is to be torn to pieces in the amphitheatre as soon as we have gone away. They are afraid of hurting our sensitive feelings, it seems, so have determined to give the poor thing the anguish of a few more days' respite on which to think of her terrible fate, ere they send her to Heaven."

"Yes, I know," Eklis said. "I have not told you about it. I know how it must harrow your feelings."

"I thought she had passed to her reward before we came; but I saw her here this morning. She must be saved. How do you propose to accomplish it?" Klemenké said.

"It cannot be done, your Royal Highness, indeed it cannot. I have done all—everything I could; but all is useless. Fyné dare not spare her. You do not realize the terrible position she is in," Eklis said.

"Perhaps not, but it must be done. My instructions to you are that you discover the means," Klemenké said, with an air of imperious command, very unlike her usual quiet and gentle manner.

The old man shook his head. "Impossible, quite impossible," he murmured, as big tears rolled down his cheeks.

"I am quite determined, whatever my sister, my husband, or any one else may think of me for it; but can you think so meanly of them, as not to know that I shall have their fullest sympathy when they know all we do?" she said.

"Certainly you would, but——"

"It is useless to discuss matters further; I know you are faithful. See me to-morrow morning, but remember I do not go home without her. Until I have seen you again I shall tell no one. And now to turn to another subject. Tell me which are the parts of this play I am called upon to admire. While I am here I must do my best to please these people."

Eklis gave the needful hints, which she listened to with as much attention as if her mind had been quite unoccupied.



The palace theatre was not a large one, but it was admirably fitted up and sumptuously decorated. Our party, of course, occupied the royal boxes. In the front row of the pit were the royal slaves, each one dressed to produce effect, in the most splendid garments. It was evident that some artist with good taste in colour had degraded himself by superintending the costumes of these unhappy creatures. Prominent among them in the centre of the front row was Britna, the unhappy girl already doomed to a death from which human nature shrinks in horror. Of all those in her miserable position, she was by far the most beautiful, the only one indeed in whose features there was any trace of the higher order of intelligence. Her rich golden hair was braided with gems, she wore an emerald necklace of great value, costly bracelets clasped her wrists. Had she not been true to her honour and her faith, she might have been the reigning favourite of the tyrant. As she had from her first entrance into that abode of sin and shame, conducted herself as it became a Christian maiden, it gave the Emperor's jaded mind a kind of dull excitement, which he regarded as pleasurable, to know that preparatory to the cruel death he had awarded her—though on Fyné it fell to give the order—he could add additional torment to the few days which were left her on earth, by compelling her to be a spectator of these court festivities. The girls around her, most of them enjoyed these things; their magnificent dresses gave them pleasure, and the lights and scenery, the acting and the royal and noble people around, all had charms for their vulgar minds. None of them were Christians, and few, if indeed there were any, felt degraded by their unhappy position. Many of them hated Britna on account of her grace of manner and extreme beauty; there were but few who did not feel a secret pleasure in knowing that in a very few days they would be for ever rid of her silent protest, though all but the most degraded and heartless among them wished that they might be spared the horror of seeing her die in the arena.

Klemenké recognized the poor creature as soon as she entered. Her bosom swelled with indignation; she had not anticipated this additional outrage on human feeling. Had not everything depended on her winning the cruel tyrant's good opinion, she must have spoken. Fyné and she sat near each other, somewhat apart from the rest. Klemenké gave full attention to the piece; from time to time the Emperor could

overhear her whispering laudatory remarks to Fyné. Fyné had seen it several times before and therefore could not be expected to be so absorbed by admiration. The Emperor was delighted by the evident interest which this stranger Princess showed during the performance, and his pleasure knew no bounds when at supper she began to praise it. By what he felt to be a supreme exercise of the critical faculty, the parts she dwelt upon with the most evident delight, being in almost every instance those which he himself valued the most highly.

"I never had a friend before," he said, "who possessed such a refined taste for the higher poetry. If Fyné will spare you and Prince Sessos to-morrow morning, I will read you some of my occasional verses, which even hostile critics say have merits superior to my dramas. I was born to write lyrics—to sing as the birds sing. It is only by culture that I have acquired excellence in the dramatic art."

Klemenké of course consented to the infliction, and she and Sessos spent a long morning with the Emperor. Eklis was by his side to read the verses, which he did with becoming gravity. Klemenké performed her part admirably. Sessos did the best he could, but was a comparative failure. His remarks were by no means so highly valued as hers. At intervals Fyné was in the room. She never stayed very long, but whatever was being read she had always a word of praise, usually following Klemenké's lead.

A little before luncheon they arose to retire, the Emperor remarking, with childish simplicity: "Princess, I never passed such a happy morning in my life." Eklis followed; he and Klemenké walking a little apart.

"Your acting is superb, your Royal Highness. If the matter were not so terribly serious, I should have been as much delighted as the Emperor himself, though for a far different reason," Eklis said.

"I am very, very weary," Klemenké replied.

"You have so won the heart of his Majesty, that I think if you ask him to give Britna to you he will hardly refuse. Pray let me speak to the Princess about it. I am sure in her heart she will be glad you should save the poor girl," said Eklis.

"One would hope so, but I can be sure of nothing in this abode of demons. Surely I shall be doing her a kindness if I cause her to have one murder the less on her soul," Klemenké

answered. "What is to be done if he refuses?" she inquired, after a long pause.

"Nothing!" replied Eklis, sadly.

"Yes—in that extreme case, I shall carry her off by force. Our sailors will, I am sure, obey me; and I shall not tell my husband till all is over, so that he may repudiate his wife's conduct if he likes. The laws of hospitality have their limits," she said.

They separated, soon to meet again. During the short interval that had gone by, a conference between Eklis and their hostess had taken place. At luncheon Fyné was more than ordinarily delightful, carefully avoiding any of those topics on which she was so fond of dilating, whereon she knew her Christian visitors would not be in agreement with her.

"We will now have a long drive in the East Park," she said; "you have not yet seen it, and it is very lovely, but before we go I will ask the Emperor if he will honour us with his society this evening. He is so fascinated with your conversation, that I am quite sure he will come." As she spoke she gave one glance of intelligent sympathy towards Klemenké, who then knew that, so far as Fyné was concerned, her cause was gained. But could the Princess help her in a matter where the tyrant's cruel fancy was so ardently stimulated in the direction of evil? She could not tell. Her heart at times sunk within her, but she had strength of will sufficient to seem cheerful and interested in all she saw.

Dinner was hardly over when the Emperor arrived. They adjourned to the cabinet, as it was called, the room wherein we first saw Fyné. It had not been inhabited during the day, and was therefore pleasantly cool.

Sessos, who was not in the secret, endeavoured to engage the Emperor in conversation, but it was useless. He had to be content with the far more brilliant discourse of Fyné and the other ladies. The Emperor had brought with him a thick roll of verse, which he was preparing for the press. Each separate poem Eklis had to read aloud, and to make careful notes of those passages which more especially drew forth Klemenké's admiration. Sometimes she ventured to suggest an amendment. When this was done it was accepted with extreme avidity, and committed to paper at once, lest the aroma should evaporate. It grew very late, but the Emperor was oblivious of the progress

of the hours. Sometimes Fyné would steal a glance towards her friend which it was impossible to misinterpret.

When the bundle of papers had at last been exhausted, the Emperor said: "Princess, you are the only person who has ever appreciated my verses as they deserve. I know that I am one of the world's great poets, such a one as occurs but once in a thousand years. Will you do me a favour? It will be a very great one, I assure you. May I dedicate this forthcoming volume to you, as the only person who values what it contains at its true worth? I shall call them *Lyrics of the Palace and the Cottage*, and say—I will put it in verse if it can be made to run smoothly—that I humbly lay these withered flowers at the feet of the only one of royal race who has soul enough to see their merits or honesty enough to point out their shortcomings."

Sessos was filled with wonder. He knew that for some reason or other—why he could not divine—his wife was acting a part; he could hardly believe his ears when, after a little of what seemed bashful hesitation, she gave her consent to accept the dedication.

While the Emperor was racking his brains for the strongest and most appropriate words by which to express the depth of his gratitude, Fyné crossed over from where she had been sitting, and said: "Dear Princess, you have a question to ask his Imperial Majesty. Do not let your love of poetry drive it out of your head."

"I am so glad you have reminded me, Princess," said she, looking up innocently at Fyné. "I should really have been sorry if I had forgotten it." Then, turning to the Emperor, she continued: "There is a pretty-looking slave girl here I have taken a fancy for; will your Majesty give her to me?"

"Certainly I will, dearest lady; but how am I to identify her, there are so many," the Emperor said.

"I made a memorandum of her name and number," she said, taking a card from her purse. "It is Britta; no, I see, Britna, No. 31, a tall girl."

"Is not that the girl who would not sacrifice to the great gods of Kara, and whom you had destined to feed the tigers?" said the Emperor, looking towards Fyné.

"Yes," replied the Princess, carelessly; "but it may be better not to speak of our national customs now—our friends are Christians. Pray, let the Princess have the woman if she cares for her."

"I had quite forgotten, dear Princess ; pray, pardon me. You are so refined and cultured, I should never have known you were a Christian had not Eklis and Fyné both told me. It is a matter of political necessity, of course. These stupid differences are very bewildering to persons like ourselves, are they not? You shall certainly have the girl. I will send to-night ; but you put me in a little difficulty, which I am sure you will at once direct me how to avoid. I had sketched a poem on the glory of dying for one's opinions, in which I meant to describe No. 31. She is tall and with yellow hair ; but now she will not die for them unless you put her to death for opposing your will about some other stupid fancy. What is to be done? It is an important question which requires serious attention," said the Emperor.

"I think," interposed Fyné, "that the girl should be sent for at once and handed over to the Princess. If Chuchu gets to know you have given her away, she may be subjected to insult by that abominable ruffian. This, I am sure, would displease the Princess."

"Poor Chuchu, he has his faults, but he is faithful, very faithful. I will summon him at once."

The keeper of the slaves stood before his master. "Conduct No. 31—Britna—into our presence," the Emperor said.

In a few minutes the slave was before her master. A terrible dread came over her that some new and even worse form of cruelty than she had yet experienced was in prospect. She had no idea that Klemenké had been exerting herself on her behalf. When, however, she entered the imperial presence, and saw Klemenké and the other ladies whom she knew to be Christians, a ray of hope shot through her heart. No further wrong, she thought, could be intended when her sisters in a common faith were there.

"Britna," said the Emperor, "I have given you to the lady on the left, the Princess Klemenké of Avenka. I presented you with some jewels—you may keep the toys." Then addressing Chuchu, he added: "Let what belongs to this girl be taken to the Princess's apartments at once ; and the jewels brought here, hand them to the Princess Fyné. I shall have retired."

The poor girl knelt and kissed the tyrant's hand, and then offered a similar mark of homage to Klemenké, after which she took her station behind her new mistress's chair,

awaiting orders. No word was uttered. Klemenké dared not trust herself to speak or even to look upon her new acquisition.

"I must tear myself away," said the Emperor; "but, dear Princess, before I go, do give me a hint as to how my poem is to end. The slave was, I am sure you will remember, to die for her opinions. This would have made a splendid dramatic ending. There would have been first the stately figure of the girl, her long golden hair floating behind her, as she walked with firm and stately steps into the arena, and then the tigers, three of them, with their striped coats and fierce bright eyes, and the roar of the mob of Kara, in their wild delight at the spectacle—a quarter of a million of my subjects all shouting with one voice—they delight in scenes of blood. I do not like them, they affect my nerves so. Then, when all is over, the crowd thinning and thinning till there is no one left except the keepers in that vast building; night comes on, and then some people in disguise, who believe in her superstition, who have bribed the keepers to carry away the remains. I might have had a scene at the graveside; pitch dark night, the place lighted by the faint glimmer of a single lantern; but not one word of this can appear now. How is she to be delivered? A Christian knight will not do, it is too commonplace; been done over and over again."

Klemenké was trembling with indignation. Fyné and her husband saw it and feared an outburst of fierce anger. Probably no one in the room was unaware of the effect the Emperor's words had produced except the speaker himself. He was so far carried away by the flatteries he had received as to be quite unconscious that he had said anything calculated to give offence. She was silent for a few seconds, and then said, in calm tones, though her voice quivered with suppressed feeling: "I think your Majesty had far better describe just what has happened. You may say, if you like, that the Princess of Avenka wanted a new tyre-woman, that the two she had were brunettes, and she thought a blonde would contrast with them so admirably. That will be a touch of commonplace which your readers will appreciate, coming, as it will do, after such high pathos."

The Emperor did not see the sarcasm, though every one else did. He had hardly left the room when Chuchu entered with the jewel-case. He handed it, as instructed, to Fyné.

"Britna, come here, please; tell me if all of them are here," she said. The girl examined them. Then, but not till then,

Fyné made a sign for Chuchu to withdraw. "Take the case," she continued, addressing the girl, "and on no account lose sight of it until you are in the Princess's apartments. Those horrible harem guards would steal them if they could."

"Princess, one word with you in private ere you go," Fyné said, leading Klemenké into a little ante-room adjoining. "Let me thank you a thousand times for having saved that poor creature. The idea that I must consign her to death for nothing beyond an act of folly has haunted me till I have been nearly mad. I do not understand you Christians, but it is beautiful to see how you love each other. I was shocked at the way the Emperor talked in her presence, but then he is so carried away with this new fancy of verse-making, that he is regardless of anything else; besides, the idea that one of his slaves is a human being is more than he can attain to. I was so glad you did not show you were angry."

"I hope I did not, but I am not sure. I never felt so strong a desire to express my loathing," Klemenké said.

"Thank you very much, for my own sake. If you had offended him, war would have been absolutely certain. Be very careful of this poor creature while you are here. On no account let her go outside the walls of my palace, not even to accompany you, unless I am with you also. Eklis says she is a refined young woman—has the manners of a lady—how he knows I cannot tell, for he never spoke to her. What a magnificent actress you are, and how truly you have read my poor, weak cousin's character. I, who have known him all my life, could never have succeeded as you have done. If you had not made yourself so fascinating to the silly man, he never would have consented to part with her. I have tried all I could to save her and have failed. It is terrible to have to act for those who love cruelty for its own sake. Good-bye. I shall sleep better than I have done for weeks. You do not know how that pure, pale face has haunted me; but now I shall not have rest, I shall think of those two other poor creatures who are gone. Good night, dear Klemenké, and do not tell any one how weak you have found me. I am too weary to go back again, besides, I do not like to see that poor creature. Though she is saved, I feel as if I were a murderess when I am with her."



## Reviews.

---

### I.—COUNT CONSTANT LUBIENSKI, BISHOP OF SEJNY.<sup>1</sup>

THIS is one of the most interesting and edifying works on recent Polish ecclesiastical history that has yet appeared, and is deserving of a careful perusal by all who sympathize with the sufferings of the Church in Poland. It is the life of a prelate who, though he ruled over the smallest and least important diocese in the Russian Empire, was one of the greatest and holiest members of the whole Catholic Hierarchy, distinguished alike for his many wonderful natural gifts, for the saintliness of his character, for his efforts to promote the good of religion under circumstances and surroundings of a peculiarly trying and vexatious description, and who, there seems to be no reasonable doubt, ultimately sealed his testimony with his blood. It would be impossible to do justice to the work in the limits of a review, containing as it does some six hundred pages in quarto, brimful of valuable information about Russia and Poland in the fifties and sixties, in addition to the narrative of the labours of the Confessor and Martyr Bishop. We can only briefly summarize its contents, and recommend our readers to procure the book for themselves. Mgr. Lubienski, who belonged to one of the most ancient and distinguished families in Poland, was born at Warsaw on February 19, 1825, and was the third son of Comte Henri Lubienski and Irene, Comtesse Potocka. During the last three centuries the Lubienski family have given no fewer than two Primates, twelve Bishops, twenty-four priests, and about as many nuns to the Church, and of these one at least, Mathias, Primate of Poland, died in the odour of sanctity in 1652. The young Constant, who early showed signs of deep piety, was placed, at the age of fourteen, at the Jesuit College of Fribourg in Switzerland. He remained there four years, and was subsequently sent to the *École centrale des arts et manufac-*

<sup>1</sup> *Vie de Mgr. Constant Iréné, Comte Lubienski, évêque de Sejny.* Société Belge du Libraire. Bruxelles : Oscar Schepens et Cie., Editeurs, 16 Rue Treurenberg.

tures at Paris, went through a course of philosophy and law at Berlin, and studied agriculture at a model farm near Köthen, in Saxony. He seems to have had an early inclination to the ecclesiastical state, and on one occasion consulted his eldest brother on the subject. The latter replied by asking, *As tu le courage de devenir martyr?* and, Constant, after long reflection, having answered in the affirmative, received the reply, *Alors sois prêtre.* This incident was recounted by the Bishop himself some five-and-twenty years later. While at Köthen, he chose as his director the celebrated Father Beckx, subsequently General of the Society of Jesus, and with his sanction resolved on devoting his life to the priesthood. Having received the tonsure at the hands of his uncle, Mgr. Thaddie Lubienski, he entered the seminary of Kielce in 1846, and a year later that of Warsaw, under the missionaries of St. Vincent de Paul. In 1849 he received the orders of subdeacon, deacon, and priest from his uncle, and became vicaire of Wiskitki and Sainte-Croix. In 1850 his father was banished for three years to Koorsk, for establishing certain manufacturies in Poland, and the young priest obtained permission to accompany him as chaplain. An interesting description is given of his life and labours in this remote spot, where he seems to have accomplished a great deal of good, traces of which were found by Mgr. Popiel, the present Archbishop of Warsaw, when he himself was banished some thirty years later. His father having returned from exile in 1854, the Abbé Lubienski was appointed French confessor to the Church of St. Catherine at St. Petersburg, with a Catholic population of twenty-five thousand souls.

He seems to have had much success in the work of conversion, and countless schismatics were reconciled to the Church during his residence in the Russian capital. Much secrecy had of course to be observed in these cases, and when his converts desired to receive the sacraments, it was no uncommon thing for him to hear their confessions while walking about in the public gardens. Communion was given to them in private, either at his own house or at theirs. In 1857 he became chaplain of the church of the Knights of Malta at St. Petersburg, but after two years was banished to Charkow, in consequence of his opposition to the attempts of the Government to compel all priests throughout the Empire to refuse the sacraments to any one who did not belong to the Latin rite. This was aimed at the Ruthenians, who had been forcibly

enrolled in the ranks of the Orthodox Church, and deprived of the ministrations of their own clergy. He remained at Charkow for a year, and laboured zealously among the Polish soldiers in garrison and other Catholics, mostly students of the Universities. In 1860 he was recalled from exile, and appointed parish priest of Revel, a port of some consequence on the Baltic. About a year after, he succeeded in making a journey to Rome, where he was honoured with three private audiences by Pius IX., and had also many interviews with Cardinal Antonelli, Mgr. Franchi, Father Beckx, the General of the Society of Jesus, and other distinguished ecclesiastics. The Holy Father seems to have been much impressed with the young Polish priest, and attached considerable importance to his opinion upon the state of affairs in Poland. On his return from Rome, he refused the archbishopric of Warsaw, from motives of humility, but succeeded in obtaining the appointment of Mgr. Felinski instead. In 1862, fresh efforts were made to induce him to undertake the episcopal yoke, and he at length consented to accept the see of Sejny, the poorest and least important in Poland. Great difficulties were thrown in the way of his consecration, and that of his friend Mgr. Popiel, by the Polish national party, and permission had actually to be obtained from Rome for one Bishop to consecrate the latter.

Nothing can well be more edifying than the history of the six years of Mgr. Lubienski's episcopate. It is a record of faithful struggle for the liberty of the Church and the good of souls, on the part of the zealous Bishop, hampered and hindered as he was at every turn by the opposition of the Muscovite Government and its officials, now brutal in their violence, now cloaking their intentions with hypocritical ingenuity, but always pursuing the same end—the Russification of Poland and the detachment of the Polish Church from the communion of the Apostolic See. On the other hand, the Bishop was pursued by the hatred of the Polish national party, whose respect for religion and its ministers was scanty in the extreme. These people seem to have cherished an undying animosity to Mgr. Lubienski, who early detected the Masonic motor-power which lay behind the movement, and who, while deeply sympathizing with the cruel wrongs of his country, declined to believe that they could be remedied by revolutionary violence. His high birth and courtly manners made Mgr. Lubienski a *persona grata* in Russian circles, where, as we have mentioned, he was enabled to do much good,

and this seems to have embittered the Polish nationalists against him. Although his communications with Rome were necessarily infrequent and always difficult, he was held in the highest respect and esteem by Pius IX. Towards the close, however, of his life, the Holy Father condemned the course he had taken in yielding to the demands of the Government, and sending a delegate from his diocese to take part in the proceedings of the so-called Catholic College at St. Petersburg. As soon as he became aware of this, the Bishop hastened to repair his error, by recalling the delegate, and informing both the Russian authorities and also all the Bishops of Poland both at home and in exile, that he had done so. His letter to the Holy Father, and that to Count Berg, the Governor-General of Poland, in both of which he avows his error and retracts it unconditionally, are written in terms of the deepest humility and contrition, and the Pope hastened to console him in a brief of much dignity and kindness, of which unfortunately no copy exists.

The Bishop seems to have felt that he was signing his own death-warrant in recalling his assessor, nor was he mistaken. He was arrested in his episcopal dwelling on May 31, 1869, at three o'clock in the morning, by General Moëller, the chief of police at Warsaw, and sent on at once under escort to Moscow, *en route* for Perm, all his papers at the same time being seized. On June 3, he arrived at Orel, and spent the night in a private house in custody of Colonel Korzelewski.

Le Comte Berg lui-même raconta au Comte Thomas, après le décès de Mgr. Constant, que c'est justement à Orel, et probablement dans cette maison, que l'Evêque exilé mangeât une compote d'oranges que le colonel lui avait préparée et présentée lui-même, et qu'il fut aussitôt pris de violentes douleurs et de vomissements qui firent le prélude de sa dernière maladie.

The dying Bishop in vain demanded a physician and a confessor, but both were refused him, and he was compelled to continue his journey. On June 6, he reached Nijny Novogorod, and after nine days of terrible suffering, the Abbé Orlicki was at length allowed to see him. He was in full possession of all his faculties, but unable to speak, *tellement sa langue était brûlée*. Extreme Unction was duly administered, but it was found impossible to give him the Viaticum. The Bishop shed abundance of tears, and confessed by signs, holding the crucifix in his hands, which he frequently kissed, and kept raising his eyes to heaven. At length on the morning of June 16, 1869,

he passed away at seven o'clock, at the age of forty-four. Ample proof is given of the cause of the holy confessor's death, but we have not space for any extracts, save the following words of Pius IX., pronounced a few months after to Mr. Charles Bodenhams and other relatives of Mgr. Lubienski.

Oh ! je vous félicite d'avoir au ciel un si proche parent évêque et martyr. J'ai fait examiner sur les lieux par un envoyé spécial les circonstances qui ont accompagné sa mort, et je n'ai plus aucun doute à ce sujet.

The only thing which detracts from the value of the work, is that it is published anonymously. The authors tell us that they are four in number, and that every incident in the book is either known to them personally or vouched for by survivors and contemporaries of Mgr. Lubienski. We can understand that if they are living in the dominions of the Czar, they may hesitate, with the fate of Mgr. Lubienski before their eyes, to attach their names to so terrible an exposure of the secrets of the prison-house.

---

## 2.—POPE LEO XIII.<sup>1</sup>

We are glad to draw attention to this readable little volume on the Life of Pope Leo XIII., translated from the French of M. Julien de Narfon and published in England by Messrs. Chapman and Hall. It is attractively illustrated, it is legibly printed, and it is easily skimmed through. To say the truth, it is not so much for the sake of our readers themselves that we welcome M. de Narfon's book, as for the non-Catholic friends to whom we hope that they will make it known. The general public can only afford a small modicum of time and attention for even the most attractive of personalities in the Roman Church, and the sketch here supplied, as it seems to us, will meet that demand. It gives a pleasant, and we believe quite truthful, impression of the character of His Holiness. In this way it is likely to do much indirect good in correcting prejudices and removing misunderstandings. The shortcomings of the book are not such as to attract the attention of the average Protestant reader.

It must be confessed, however, that M. de Narfon's volume in itself will not bear very close scrutiny. It is at best a fairly

<sup>1</sup> *Pope Leo XIII. His Life and Work.* By Julien de Narfon. Translated from the French by E. A. Raper. London : Chapman and Hall, 1899.

skilful piece of book-making. Larger volumes such as Boyer d'Agen's *Jeunesse de Léon XIII.*, Goyeau's *Le Vatican*, Lucius Lector's *Le Conclave*, and the older Lives of Leo XIII. have been liberally laid under contribution, and the writer's own share is seemingly very slender. No doubt many of the facts which have been picked out and strung together are in themselves interesting. Such a tribute as the following extract from the private correspondence of the violent anti-clerical writer, Urbano Ratazzi, may be quoted as a specimen :

This Pecci is a man of undeniable merit. He is gifted with great energy and power of management, coupled with the mildest manners imaginable. The fact is that, in spite of his incorruptibility and loftiness of mind, and in spite of the deep-rooted respect he has inspired in our officials, Cardinal Pecci's concessions will be mere matters of form. He will give way just to the extent that would be expected of a man of the world and no more. He is very strongly attached to the Holy See, and his principles are unbending. A man of his invincible, almost aggressive firmness will not yield. He has considerable political talent, and his knowledge is still more extensive.

The translator, as this extract shows, has executed his task with tolerable success. It is to be regretted, however, that the version has not been revised by some competent person familiar with the phraseology usual among Catholics. It is irritating to come across such phrases as "June 21st, the fête-day of St. Louis of Gonzaga,"<sup>1</sup> or "the Pope sups at ten o'clock after having told his rosary."<sup>2</sup> Still more serious are the blunders accumulated in the following passage. It occurs in a description of the death of Pius IX. : "The major-domo and the chief usher of the confidential *camerieri* were already in attendance, while the penitents [*sic* ; *lege* penitentiaries] of St. Peter [*sic*] knelt near the bed, reciting the burial service [*sic*] and the penitential psalms. Robed in violet—the cardinals' mourning colour—without his camail [*sic*] and his rochet covered by a purple mantle [*sic*] Cardinal Pecci approached the lifeless body of Pius IX." It is only fair to say that similar passages are not of frequent occurrence. Some of the mistakes also, especially in the matter of names and ceremonial details, must be attributed not to the translator but to the author himself. The illustrations, as already remarked, are numerous and attractive, but most of them, we fancy, have done duty before.

Finally, we may remark that this little volume affords ample

<sup>1</sup> P. 22.

<sup>2</sup> P. 164.

justification for the articles which in the last two numbers of THE MONTH have exposed for the hundredth time the fraudulent character of the so-called prophecies of St. Malachy. Both on page 126 and more fully in the final chapter they are discussed with all seriousness, though the author does not exactly commit himself to the defence of their authenticity.

---

### 3.—THE KING'S MOTHER.<sup>1</sup>

The personality of Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond, the mother of Henry VII., is one which has always been specially attractive to English Catholic ladies, and very rightly. We have a vivid picture of her character from her confessor, Blessed John Fisher, in his *Mornyng Remembrance*, or funeral sermon, and it reveals her to us as the model of a Christian lady, and of the perfection to which the English type of character can rise. "Bounteous to every person of her knowledge and acquaintance, . . . of singular easiness to be spoken to and full courteous answer she would make to all, . . . of marvellous gentleness, . . . unkind she would not be unto no creature, . . . ready to forget and forgive injuries, . . . to God and the Church full obedient and tractable, seeking His honour and pleasure full busily. A wariness of herself she had to eschew everything that might dishonest any noble woman, . . . frivolous things . . . she would let pass by, but the others that were of weight and substance . . . she would not let for any pain or labour to take in hand." She was notable, too, for her religious foundations, and for the patronage she extended to the early printers. And although she showed herself singularly retiring during the troubled times of the Civil Wars, she had, as one so closely connected with the succession, to play her part in public affairs, which she ever did with wisdom and discretion.

Lady Margaret Domville has put together a useful little memoir. She has gleaned materials from every possible quarter, and has given us, along with the life of her heroine, a contribution to the history of the Wars of the Roses. It is indeed quite an historical work—for she has taken great pains to be accurate, and reasons like a practised historian.

<sup>1</sup> *The King's Mother.* A Memoir of Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby. By Lady Margaret Domville. London: Burns and Oates.



4—CARMEL IN ENGLAND.<sup>1</sup>

Father Zimmerman's history of Carmel in England is for many reasons a valuable contribution to our English Catholic literature. To begin with, it is an edifying book in the best sense of the words. One hears the old missionaries re-telling their stories of adventure, suffering, and success, and it is impossible not to be struck by the simple goodness of their self-sacrificing lives. We see them engaged in every sort of charitable work, and dealing with all conditions of men from queens, ambassadors, and duchesses to actresses, poor needle-women, and prisoners. Sometimes they are hoaxed by beggars, too often they suffer grievously at the hands of their bigoted Protestant fellow-countrymen; but, as a rule, their life is one of seclusion and quiet, but laborious retirement. When we have made due allowance for changes of time and taste, the story is one which appeals strongly to our sympathies, and makes us live again the hard but ennobling life of our Catholic forefathers.

Father Zimmerman's book also illustrates an important period in our English Catholic history. The Carmelite mission did not begin till after the age of Elizabeth, the period of persecution *par excellence*, had closed. But the friars played a not unimportant part in the succeeding stage in our history, the "foundation movement," if I may so call it, when in a single generation the number of our orders, convents, and monasteries were multiplied ten-fold. The great service which the Carmelites then bestowed on our Church at large, as distinguished from their ministrations to individuals, was their furnishing a supply of chaplains for the Spanish Embassy, and later on for that of Portugal. Father Zimmerman's volume would have gained by a more systematic exposition of the good work done in the Embassy chapels, which were then the only public Catholic churches in England. Such an account would also have served as a thread to string together one part of his discourse with another. The form of biographies, which he has chosen, is liable to the charge of being disjointed.

<sup>1</sup> *Carmel in England. A History of the English Mission of the Discalced Carmelites, 1615 to 1849*, drawn from documents preserved in the Archives of the Order, by Father B. Zimmerman, O.C.D. (Father Benedictus-Maria a Santa Cruce). London: Burns and Oates, 1899. 399 pp. Price six shillings.

What is perhaps most valuable about these biographies is that they are drawn from entirely new sources. In spite of the wide research of writers like Simpson, Foley, Morris, and others, who have illustrated this part of our history, none of them seem to have suspected what abundant historical material was preserved by the Carmelites. Father Zimmerman has put us all under a great obligation by introducing us to the archives of his Order. So far as we can judge from his references, there must be plenty left which ought to see the light.

We would suggest, in view of such publications, that admirable as the author's command of English is, he should, nevertheless, not dispense with the advice of those who are familiar even with the fine shades of meaning that differentiate such words as "novel" from "new,"<sup>1</sup> and "likely" from "perhaps,"<sup>2</sup> and "solemn vow" from "oath."<sup>3</sup> Scholars, too, may be offended at errors in the names of well-known authors, as "Harfeld and Pith" for "Harpsfield and Pitts." But blemishes such as these must be accounted very venial when compared with the great merits to which almost every page of Father Zimmerman's book may lay just claim.

---

#### 5.—CATHOLIC CONTROVERSY.<sup>4</sup>

It was not till a magisterial decree forbade the inhabitants of the Chablais to attend his sermons or hold intercourse with him, that St. Francis de Sales had the idea of committing his defence of the Catholic Faith to writing. He cast it in the form of a letter, addressed to the citizens of Thonon, and it became the means whereby he was enabled to bring back to the truth the entire population of the district. A book on such a subject, with such a record, and written by a Saint, is worthy of our attention, and Canon Mackey has provided us with the first English translation of it. Or rather, he has done much more than that, since he has spent infinite pains in providing us with an accurate text. For the treatise was not published during the life-time of its author, but was distributed part by part in manuscript copies to the people for whom it was intended. It

<sup>1</sup> P. 104.

<sup>2</sup> P. 29.

<sup>3</sup> P. 26.

<sup>4</sup> *Library of St. Francis de Sales. III. Catholic Controversy.* By the Very Rev. H. B. Canon Mackey, O.S.B. Second Edition, revised and augmented. London: Burns and Oates.

was not published till 1672, fifty years after the death of the Saint, by one Leonard of Paris, and this man took strange liberties with the text, garbling the quotations, destroying the accuracy of the references, and freely altering the language according to his own taste. All these defects, which marred the character of the book, and seriously impaired its argumentative value, Canon Mackey has removed, after a careful collation of the two autographs at Rome and Annecy.

We now have, then, the work, just as it left the author's hands, and, as Canon Mackey remarks with much justice, to many it will be a new revelation of the Saint.

The same calm sanctity, the same heavenly wisdom, the same charisma of sweetness, pervade all his works, but as a controversialist, as a champion of the Church, he here puts on the martial bearing, takes up those mighty weapons, proper to inspire confidence into his comrades, and to make his enemies quail before him.

The treatise is valuable also in another way. Written so long ago and at a time when the Protestant Revolt was still in its infancy, and the Gallican heresy as yet unborn, one naturally looks to it to see what will be its bearing towards these positions—whether it will assail them with arguments which have since had to be abandoned, or with authorities which have since been proved spurious. What we do find is that St. Francis argues against Protestantism just as we do, often stating his points with a force and felicity that we may well imitate; that his teaching on Papal infallibility, which he puts forward in apparent unconsciousness that a Catholic could think differently, is quite that of a modern "Ultramontane." It is seldom, too, that he cites a spurious authority. We might have expected him to quote freely from the False Decretals, but we have found but one insignificant use made of them, and that is probably a slip of the pen. He does once or twice accept as authentic parts of the Clementine Recognitions, but the whole of what he borrows from that source might be cast out of his pages without affecting his reasoning.

As a specimen of his effective way of presenting his points we may give the following passage:

Whoever will read the Scriptures attentively will see this Primacy of St. Peter everywhere. If the Church is compared to a building, as it is, its rock and secondary foundation is St. Peter. (Matt. xvi.)

If you say it is like a family, it is only our Lord who pays tribute as the head of the household, and after Him St. Peter as His lieutenant. (*Ib.* xvii.) If to a ship, St. Peter is its captain, and in it our Lord teaches. (Luke v.) If to a fishery, St. Peter is the first in it; the true disciples of our Lord only fish with him. (*Ib.* and John xxi.) If to draw-nets (Matt. xiii.), it is St. Peter who casts them into the sea, St. Peter who draws them; the other disciples are his coadjutors. It is St. Peter who brings them to land and presents the fish to our Lord. (Luke v.; John xxi.) Do you say it is an embassy?—St. Peter is first ambassador. (Matt. x.) Do you say it is a brotherhood?—St. Peter is first, the governor and confirmer of the rest. (Luke xxii.) Would you rather have it a kingdom?—St. Peter receives the keys. (Matt. xvi.) Will you consider it a flock or fold of sheep and lambs?—St. Peter is its pastor and shepherd-general. (John xxi.) Say now in conscience, how could our Lord testify His intention more distinctly?

Is it too much to hope that the esteem they so generally cherish for St. Francis will attract to this little treatise some of our Anglican brethren who refuse even to open the works of a modern controversialist. Dr. Rivington has left it on record that he was singularly helped by this very book. Now that it appears in a better and more available form, we will at all events recommend it to Anglican inquirers.

---

#### 6.—THE ROYAL ACADEMY AND OTHER EXHIBITIONS.<sup>1</sup>

*Concerning the Royal Academy and the Paris International Exhibition of 1900, and other Reveries*, is the somewhat pretentious title of five discursive little essays dealing with the artistic delinquencies of our national art societies. We do not quite see the aptitude of the word "reverie" as applied to thoughts which if neither novel nor profound, are quite sensible, just, and wide-awake, though diluted in a literary style which, by its frequent affectations and straining after brilliancy of expression, loses both in sincerity and force. While we heartily agree with much that Mr. Naegely says, we doubt whether his way of saying it will carry conviction to any one to whom it is not already obvious.

The subjects of some of Mr. Naegely's most reasonable complaints have their origin in certain national characteristics

<sup>1</sup> *Concerning the Royal Academy and the Paris International Exhibition of 1900, and other Reveries.* By Henry Naegely. London: Elliot Stock.

lying far deeper down than he seems to realize. The Anglo-Saxon race, highly endowed though it be, can hardly be called artistic. Its attitude towards art, which undeniably is often most reprehensible, is due not so much to sins of wilful commission that may be repented of, as to the invincible ignorance of an inherent artistic obtuseness for which there appears to be no remedy except that of being "born over again and born different." When we have put a decent flooring to our National Gallery and harmoniously decorated its walls, when we have done away with objectionably reflective hand-rails and relegated obtrusive charwomen to their proper hours of usefulness, we shall still all unconsciously find a hundred other equally effectual modes of offending against that finer artistic sense of which Mr. Naegely is the exponent.

On the other hand, the British instinct for "fair play" should surely interfere to prevent such tangible abuses as that of the representation of British art in foreign international exhibitions being practically in the hands of one man, and he the official head of national academism. If Mr. Naegely has not overstated the case—and we have no reason to suppose he has—he deserves gratitude for protesting against an obvious injustice which is matter of facts and figures, and which as such should surely be capable of reform by the nation to whom, of all others, facts and figures possess a power of persuasive appeal.

Mr. Naegely intersperses his "reveries" on our official systems with some scraps of genuine art-criticism applied to various famous pictures and monuments. In these he manifests his possession of fine artistic perception—a quality which should have prevented his indulging in such utter fatuity as the following sentence, which is an example of his manner at his worst:

If Art would but stay rigidly, austere, within her limits, I should feel less anxious about her future; but these fatal confusions, these over-lappings of antagonistic ideas, these well-meant, but indefensible theories, are driving her farther and farther from her course; and although I do not despair of her ultimate safety, I can quite understand that the faint-hearted are less hopeful.

7.—NATURAL LAW AND LEGAL PRACTICE.<sup>1</sup>

These are twelve lectures on Teleology, Natural Law, Human Acts, Freedom of the Will, Utilitarianism, Justice, The State, Property, Taxation, Conflict of Rights, Capital and Labor, Legal Ethics. In an appendix there are twenty-eight short rules for the guidance of a lawyer's professional conduct. The lectures deal incidentally with a large number of subjects. They are not meant for specialists. Their aim is to instil a little philosophy and sound morality into lawyers and business men. We wish such persons would all buy the book and read two pages a day. The world would be the better thereby. The following, for instance, might form one profitable lecture.

*Practical rules of State polity [policy?].*

The State must not remain inactive when an object essential to the public welfare can be attained only by corporate action. Whenever an object can be attained as well by private enterprise, leave it to private enterprise. The State must not attempt to displace private industry in order to become itself a trader. Since the State must enforce contracts, it must beware of lending its sanction to fraudulent or iniquitous contracts. Never frame a new law without being certain that it is a notable improvement on previous legislation. Never put a new restriction on the liberty of the citizen, unless order and peace require this limitation *imperatively*. The State must protect children as well as other defenceless persons: but it would commit a breach of natural law were it to substitute its authority for that of the parents. No plurality of suffrage can justify the invasion of the rights of the minority by the majority, however large the majority may be. The majority may be overwhelming, it may be able to crush the minority, but *Might is not right*. The former is a material, the latter a moral power.

<sup>1</sup> *Natural Law and Legal Practice*. Lectures delivered at the Law School of Georgetown University, by René I. Holaind, S.J. Benziger. 344 pp.

## *Literary Record.*

---

### I.—BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

*The New Materialism, or Some Vagaries of Modern Thought* (Browne and Nolan) is by Father E. Gaynor, C.M., and is mainly a reprint of some articles which originally appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*. It examines into the evidences for the materialistic views about matter and about life, and is to be followed by a companion volume on materialistic views about animals and about man. It detracts from its merit that it is too fond of hectoring language—*e.g.*, "Luckily for the credit of the human intellect, Tyndall and Co. were not left superfluously 'potential in the fires of the sun,' where they could be of little use, but by a merciful dispensation of atoms have been given to enlighten the world. . . . Such intellectual farthing candles as St. Thomas, Leibnitz, Faraday, and Lord Kelvin, may now, we suppose, be blown out." Such flippancy tends only to predispose earnest minds against a book, which would be a pity in the present case, as the author has really put together some useful information. He does not, indeed, pretend to give the results of any research of his own, nor does he write for proficients in physical studies. But for the victims of club and drawing-room talk, who imagine that modern science has proved to demonstration that the vital action in organic bodies is merely a more complicated action of the same physical and chemical forces which are at work in the inorganic world, Father Gaynor's little book should be found useful. For it shows by quotations from the best modern authorities, many of them the very leaders of the materialistic school, that the whole tendency of recent research has gone the opposite way, and has piled up evidence beyond what we formerly possessed, to prove that organic life has an action of its own, absolutely unique, and absolutely distinct from the action of the inorganic forces which it uses as its instruments.



*The Evolution of the Human Body* (Washbourne) is by Father Wilfrid Lescher, and is the second edition, revised and enlarged, of a paper read before the Academia in 1888. The name would suggest that it is in defence of the theory that man's body, though not his soul, may have been evolved from some lower form of life. This, however, is not the case. The author's purpose is to show that, as the Council of Vienne has defined, the soul is the *forma substantialis* of the body, and that the real tendency of modern experimental research is to confirm the truth of that ancient doctrine. He works out his point well, and has some apt quotations.

The writer of *Are Catholics reasonable in their belief?* (Burns and Oates, Benziger) is a young American priest, Father M. P. Seter. He gives a summary of the treatise *De Vera Religione*, as he learnt it from his Louvain professors. It is accurately worded, and shows that he has a good grasp of his matter, and it may prove of use if it should fall into the hands of any one fond of thinking out a stiff metaphysical puzzle. But the author, when his ministerial experience is riper, will learn that the generality of readers cannot take in their theological arguments neat.

Messrs. Browne and Nolan have brought out a cheap popular edition of Cardinal Moran's *Occasional Papers*. The eminent writer's name will of itself attract readers, but the book can stand on its own merits. The Cardinal has a special gift for composing clear and informing popular addresses. The papers on Self-Culture and on the Massacre of St. Bartholomew are particularly good.

Father Wilfrid Dallow has compiled a *Catholic Visitor's Guide to Rome* (Washbourne), chiefly for the use of pilgrims. They may be glad of an aid which regards the different objects of interest from a Catholic's, not an ordinary sight-seer's point of view.

*Canon James Gordon's Seven Lectures on some of the Doctrines of the Catholic Church* (Washbourne) was published in 1890, and was received with so much favour that the edition was sold out within a short time. It is now passing into a new edition by request. As the text remains unchanged it will be enough to announce its reappearance, and to recommend it as a clear and temperately-expressed account of the evidence for Papal Supremacy and Infallibility, Saint-Worship, Purgatory, Confession, and Indulgences.

The Catholic Truth Society sends four new tracts. *The Catholic Church in the Scriptures* is by the Bishop of Nottingham. It shows how the Catholic Church alone among the existent religious communions corresponds with the idea of the Church as set forth both in Old Testament prophecies and New Testament descriptions. *Anglican prejudices against the Catholic Church* is the reprint, with slight revisions, of a letter written to a friend by Lady Herbert of Lea, soon after her reception into the Church. *Mother Frances Mary Teresa Ball* and *St. Odilia* are new numbers of the Rosary Series, one giving an account of the Foundress of the Sisters of Mercy, the other of the patron saint of Alsace.

In *Gems from the Early Church* (Art and Book Co.), Mrs. E. F. Bowden has compiled a very pleasantly-written volume from the Acts of the Martyrs and the Chronicles of the Fathers of the Desert. We have not compared her versions or adaptations with the originals, but the stories read pleasantly, and we doubt not that they reproduce the primitive legends with reasonable fidelity. The book is not erudite but popular in scope, and perhaps we ought to be contented that Mrs. Bowden has gone for her standards of historical criticism to the older Bollandists, to Baronius, Dom Guéranger, Ruinart, and the Roman Breviary. None the less, we fancy that the modern continuators of the *Acta Sanctorum* would make short work of some of the stories which the volume contains. Neither can it be needful to repeat here that the insertion of a legend in the Breviary is no guarantee of its historical accuracy. Details which have appeared in successive editions of the Roman Breviary for three hundred years past have in more than one instance been cut away by the wiser discretion of its modern correctors, and there is every reason to hope that this process of revision is as yet only in its infancy.

---

## II.—MAGAZINES.

*Some contents of foreign Periodicals :*

The ÉTUDES. (August 5 and August 20.)  
 The Youth of Louis Veuillot. *G. Longhaye*. The Ritualistic Crisis in England. *H. M. Le Bachelet*. Soldierly Profiles, IV. A Volunteer in Algiers: General Fleury. *H. Chérot*. Father Gabriel Desjardins. *H. Martin*. Recent Literature

—a Study in Criticism. *V. Delaporte.* Madame de Staël. *G. Longhaye.* The Nosairis. *H. Lammens.* Teaching and Education. *J. Burnichon.* Reviews, &c.

STIMMEN AUS MARIA LAACH. (August.)

The Marxian Theory of Modern Society. *H. Pesch.* Modern Hindooism under the influence of Christian Ideas. *A. Hegglin.* The Social Decomposition of Protestantism. *R. von Nostitz-Rieneck.* The Oldest Maps of the World. *J. Schwarz.* Drinking Water and Epidemics. *H. Kemp.* Reviews, &c.

DER KATHOLIK. (August.)

Rigorism and the Number of the Elect. The Love of Truth among the Catholics and Protestants. The Absolution of Cases reserved to the Pope. *J. Becker.* New Lights on the History of Ancient Monachism. The Origin and Development of the Pallium. The Controversy about Biblical Criticism. *Prof. Sachs.* Reviews, &c.

LA CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA. (August.)

The Centenary of Pius VI. The Italian Dialects and the Italy of History. The Decadence and Degradation of Art. Americanism and the Bishops of the United States. The Condemnation of Savonarola's Works and the Reformed Priests of the Bon Gesù. Telepathy and Presentiments. The Moral Teaching of Positivism. Archæology—The Use of Flowers among the Early Christians in the Burial of the Dead. Reviews, &c.

L'UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE.

Denis Petau—a Master of Positive Theology. *R. Parayre.* Eden. *F. D. Curley.* Henry Becque's Play, *Lex Corbeaux.* *Abbé Delfour.* Perugino and the Early Umbrian School. *Abbé Broussolle.* Alcoholism. *R. P. Arduin.* The Growth and Decline of a Famous Abbey. *T. Delmont.* Recent Works on Holy Scripture. *E. Jacquier.* Reviews, &c.

REVUE BÉNÉDICTINE.

A New Collection of the Homilies of St. Cæsarius of Arles. *Dom G. Morin.* Unprinted Letters of French Benedictines. *Dom U. Berlière.* The Congregation of Bursfeld. The New Papal Constitution for the Anglo-Benedictine Congregation. Reviews, &c.

